F. KONSTANTINOV

ROLE OF ADVANCED IDEAS IN DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETY

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE

F. KONSTANTINOV

ROLE OF ADVANCED IDEAS IN DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETY

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
Moscow 1954

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN

CONTENTS

	Page
OBJECTIVE CHARACTER OF THE LAWS OF DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETY	5
SOURCE OF THE ORIGIN OF SOCIAL IDEAS	25
CLASS CHARACTER OF IDEOLOGY, OF SOCIAL IDEAS IN ANTAGONISTIC SOCIETY	48
ROLE OF ADVANCED IDEAS IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT	60
ROLE OF SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY IN THE BUILDING OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY	72

OBJECTIVE CHARACTER OF THE LAWS OF DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETY

Prior to Marx and Engels there was no real social science. Bourgeois sociologists and historians regarded the history of society as an agglomeration of "accidents," errors and delusions. They asserted that unlike nature where strict necessity, regularity and recurrence of phenomena dominate, in human history everything depends on the will of man, his consciousness, aims and intentions, and on his reason. In the history of society, as distinguished from that of nature, they argued, there are not, nor can there be, objective laws independent of the will and consciousness of man. Everything depends on chance and collision of countless "accidents," including the errors and delusions of statesmen, the whims of favourites of kings and queens.

In creating the real science of the laws governing the development of society—historical materialism—Marx and Engels criticized every aspect of the idealistic outlook on the history of society. They proved that the development of society is a strictly law-governed and necessary process.

In evaluating the great revolution accomplished by Marx and Engels in the realm of social science, in the interpretation of social life and the history of society, V. I. Lenin wrote:

"Just as Darwin put an end to the view that the species of animals and plants are unconnected among themselves, fortuitous, 'created by God' and immutable, and was the first to put biology on an absolutely scientific basis by establishing the mutability and succession of species, so

Marx put an end to the view that society is a mechanical aggregation of individuals, which allows of any kind of modification at the will of the powers that be (or, what amounts to the same thing, at the will of society and the government) and which arises and changes in a fortuitous way; he was the first to put sociology on a scientific basis by establishing the concept of the economic formation of society as the sum total of given relations of production and by establishing the fact that the development of these formations is a process of natural history."*

Just as the relations and interdependence of natural phenomena are an objective law independent of the will of men, so the relations and interdependence of the phenomena of social life constitute an objective law of social life, likewise independent of the will and consciousness of men.

Unlike the laws issued by the state, expressing the will of one or another class, the laws of nature, the laws of development of society, including the economic laws of socialist society, exist objectively, outside our consciousness, their existence being independent of our will. These laws reflect objective processes which take place independently of anyone's will: they determine the consciousness of men. The laws of social development—whether they be laws of capitalist or socialist society—are a reflection and manifestation of historical necessity.

All scientific laws—whether they be laws of nature discovered through the natural sciences or laws of development of society discovered through the social sciences—reflect the necessary connection between phenomena and processes occurring independently of the will of men. A law expresses the relation that stems from the inner nature of things, processes and phenomena. The connection between phenomena or processes may be external and accidental or

---

* V. I. Lenin, *What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats,* Moscow 1950, p. 22.

essential, internal and substantial, when one phenomenon inavertibly gives rise to and determines another, just as cause gives rise to its effect. Thus a conflict between the productive forces and the obsolescent relations of production in an antagonistic society inevitably leads to social revolution.

Man can discover, get to know and utilize in the interests of society the laws of nature and the laws of development of society but he can neither annul nor abolish them.

As distinct from natural science, the laws of the social sciences, as, for example, the laws of political economy, are short-lived. As economic conditions change, some laws lose their validity, depart from the scene giving way to new laws that arise out of the nature of the new economic relations.

Marxist science of society, while recognizing the existence of specific laws inherent in a given social system, does not deny the presence of certain other laws valid for all social formations. Different social formations comply in their development not only with their particular, specific laws but with laws common to all formations. Socio-economic formations are not only detached from one another by their specific laws, they are linked to one another by laws of development, common to all of them.

Among these laws, inherent in all social formations, including socialist society, there is, for example, the law on the determining role of social being in relation to social consciousness. Social ideas, political, legal, esthetical and philosophical views are a reflection of the conditions of material life of society, of social being.

The more general laws of development of society include the law that relations of production must necessarily correspond to the character and level of the productive forces.

What then is the essence of this law?

In contrast to idealism which sees the main and determining force of development of society in given social ideas,

social consciousness or politics, historical materialism sees the main force which determines the character of a social system in the mode of production of material values. Without production there can be no society. Discontinuance of production would doom society.

Hence the well-known Marxist thesis: the mode of production of material values determines the structure of society, its physiognomy, ideas and institutions.

The mode of production determines not only the structure and physiognomy of society, but the changes in, and the development of, society. A change of the mode of production inevitably involves a change of the entire social system.

Hence the question: what, then, is the mode of production, on what does its change depend and what are the principal causes of this change?

There are two inseparable aspects of the mode of production: the productive forces and the relations of production. By the productive forces Marxists mean the instruments of production and the people who operate these instruments of production, who possess production experience and labour skill. The productive forces reflect the active relations of society to nature; they are an indication of the degree of power over nature attained by society. The development of the productive forces, above all the development of the instruments of production, underlies the change and development of the mode of production of material values.

But the productive forces are only one aspect of the mode of production. Another, indispensable and inalienable aspect of every social production is the relation of men to one another in the process of production.

"In production," Marx says, "men not only act on nature but also on one another. They produce only by co-operating in a certain way and mutually exchanging their activities. In order to produce, they enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social con-

nections and relations does their action on nature, does production, take place."*

It is just as impossible for people to engage in production without maintaining definite connections (relations of production), independent of their will, as it is for them to produce material values without instruments of production. Man has always been a social being. All the material and spiritual achievements have been acquired by man due to and through society. Outside society man does not exist. Historically determined social relations and, in the first place, relations of production constitute the very essence of man.

Hence, relations of production, that is, relations of people in the process of production of material values, are the second indispensable aspect of the mode of production. These relations of production are distinguished, first of all, by the form of ownership of the means of production, the resulting status and relations of the social groups and classes in the process of production and the definite forms of distribution of products entirely dependent on it. Every mode of production furnishes some kind of unity of the aforementioned two aspects—the productive forces and the relations of production, the relations of men to nature and their relations towards one another in the process of production.

But it is not only important to establish the presence of the two necessary aspects of social production, of the mode of production. In order to get at the root of the law of necessary correspondence we have to know the character of the interrelations of the two aspects of social production.

The law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces is a reflection of definite internal ties, internal relations between them, precisely of relations of necessary correspondence. In order to disclose the essence, the character of this conform-

---

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works,* Vol. I, Moscow 1951, p. 83.

ity, we must touch on some of the essential features of the productive forces and relations of production.

What are these features of the productive forces and relations of production?

The first principal feature of the productive forces is that they are the most mobile and revolutionary element of production. They can never stay at one point for a long time. Such is their character, their nature.

But this is not the only feature of the productive forces. *The second feature* is that they are the primary, determining element of the mode of production. The productive forces determine the nature, the character of the relations of production. Whatever are the productive forces, such also are the relations of production. People always enter into such relations of production that correspond to the given level of the productive forces. People cannot arbitrarily choose relations of production, they create such relations which *necessarily* correspond to the nature, character, level and state of the productive forces.

What are the distinguishing features of the relations of production? These relations are determined by the productive forces—that is their *first feature*. But having come into being, the relations of production exercise a reverse influence on the development of the productive forces. And this retroaction, this reverse influence on the productive forces may be of a dual character: it may accelerate the development of the productive forces and may arrest, retard it.

This is the *second feature* of the relations of production.

The third feature is that in contrast to the productive forces which develop more rapidly than the relations of production, outgrow them, the relations of production may and do lag behind the development of the productive forces in all social formations.

The productive forces are the content and the relations of production are their form. The form always follows in the wake of the content and somewhat lags behind the changes of the content. This general law of the interrelations between

form and content applies also to the interrelations of the productive forces and relations of production.

The history of human society is the history of the development of the productive forces and of the forms and types of relations of production which succeed one another. And this change of types of relations of production took place in conformity with the change of the character of the productive forces.

In his philosophical work *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* J. V. Stalin characterizes the development of the productive forces and relations of production, shows the dependence of the change of the relations of production on the change of the productive forces, and their necessary correspondence.

"In conformity with the change and development of the productive forces of society in the course of history," writes J. V. Stalin, "men's relations of production, their economic relations also changed and developed."*

Under the primitive communal system the relations of production were based on social ownership of the means of production. This in the main *corresponded* to the character of the productive forces of that period. The crude stone tools of labour: the stone axe, and later the bow and arrow, precluded the possibility of man combating the forces of nature and beasts of prey individually, evoking the need of common labour. Labour in *common* led to the *common* ownership of the means of production and of the fruits of production.

The growth of the productive forces, the transition from stone tools to metal implements, the development of pastunage, tillage and handicrafts and division of labour among these branches of production, led to exchange of products between individuals and between communities, to private ownership of the means of production, accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few, the minority of society, and to

---

* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1954, p. 735.

the conversion of the majority into slaves. This was the slave system. Here the relations of production correspond to the character of the productive forces on a new basis. "Here we no longer find the common and free labour of all members of society in the production process—here there prevails the forced labour of slaves, who are exploited by the non-labouring slave-owners. Here, therefore, there is no common ownership of the means of production or of the fruits of production. It is replaced by private ownership."*

Private ownership changed from the slave and feudal forms to the capitalist form as a result of, and in conformity with, the change of the character of the productive forces.

The basis of the relations of production under capitalism, which superseded feudalism, is that the capitalist owns the means of production but not the workers in production—the wage labourers. But the latter are deprived of the means of production; they are proletarians who, in order not to die of hunger, are compelled to sell their labour power to the capitalists and to bear the yoke of exploitation.

There was a time when capitalist relations of production corresponded to the character of the productive forces. In place of the handicraft workshop and manufactory, based on hand tools, there appeared huge machine-equipped mills and factories. In place of the feudal estates tilled with the primitive implements of production of the peasant (the wooden plough, sickle, reaping hook, etc.) there now emerged capitalist farms based on agricultural machinery and agricultural science.

The new productive forces called for a new worker in production, one who could handle machines. Therefore, the capitalists prefer to deal with wage workers who are free from the bonds of serfdom and who are educated enough to be able properly to operate machinery.

At one time capitalist relations of production fully corresponded to the state and level of development of the

---

* *Ibid.*, pp. 736-37.

productive forces. They allowed full scope for their development, generated and called forth incentives for development of production which, although selfish, mean, brutal and inhuman, were in those days mighty and progressive.

The aim of capitalist production was and is profit. Insatiable thirst for profit and for accumulation of capital is the incentive of capitalist production. These were the factors that urged the capitalists to expand production and develop technique. To this they were urged also, under the threat of destruction, by capitalist competition.

Marx in *Capital* quotes an eloquent excerpt from the "Quarterly Reviewer":

"... Capital eschews no profit, or very small profit, just as Nature was formerly said to abhor a vacuum. With adequate profit, capital is very bold. A certain 10 per cent. will ensure its employment anywhere; 20 per cent. certain will produce eagerness; 50 per cent., positive audacity; 100 per cent. will make it ready to trample on all human laws; 300 per cent., and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run, even to the chance of its owner being hanged."*

Because capitalist relations of production corresponded to the productive forces, to their character and growth, they ensured within a single century such a powerful development of the productive forces which all previous generations taken together could not even dream of.

"In the epoch following the bourgeois revolution," says J. V. Stalin, "when the bourgeoisie had shattered the feudal relations of production and established bourgeois relations of production, there undoubtedly were periods when the bourgeois production relations did fully conform with the character of the productive forces. Otherwise, capitalism could not have developed as swiftly as it did after the bourgeois revolution."**

---

* K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow 1954, p. 760.

** J. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, Moscow 1953, p. 57.

However, capitalist relations of production have long since turned from a form of development of the productive forces into their fetters, into a brake, retarding the development of the productive forces. Why? Because they no longer correspond to the developed productive forces. The latter have outgrown the framework of capitalist relations of production and have become glaringly incongruent with them, they conflict with them. The productive forces have become social while property, appropriation under capitalism, remains private, capitalistic and comes in conflict with the character of the productive forces.

By developing production on a vast scale and concentrating millions of wage workers in huge mills and factories the capitalists imparted a social character to the process of production. But in doing so capitalism undermines its own foundation—private capitalist ownership. The social character of the process of production calls for social ownership of the means and fruits of production. Private capitalist ownership is incompatible with the social character of the process of production. This fundamental contradiction of capitalism finds its reflection in the recurring capitalist crises of overproduction which lead to the destruction of the productive forces and the products of labour, to mass unemployment, to starvation of tens of millions of people because they produced too much. Capitalism has become enmeshed in contradictions which it is unable to solve.

"This means that the capitalist relations of production have ceased to correspond to the state of the productive forces of society and have come into irreconcilable contradiction with them.

"This means that capitalism is pregnant with revolution, whose mission it is to replace the existing capitalist ownership of the means of production by socialist ownership."*

Such a revolution has already taken place in the U.S.S.R. where the relations of production have been made fully to conform with the character of the productive forces.

* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1954, p. 739.

Such a revolution has come to pass in the countries of people's democracy where the relations of production in industry have been made to correspond to the modern character of the productive forces and in agriculture are being brought into line with it (co-operation, collectivization).

This has ensured rapid and powerful development of the productive forces of the socialist camp in contrast to the capitalist camp where the productive forces are in a state of stagnation and are doomed to destruction.

Two worlds, two camps now exist alongside and oppose one another: the socialist camp and the capitalist camp. These two camps today demonstrate two ways of economic development: a powerful development of the productive forces in the socialist camp and a state of stagnation, of marking time in the capitalist camp.

These two lines of economic development were graphically, profoundly and convincingly characterized in G. M. Malenkov's brilliant report at the XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U. In the period from 1929 to 1951 industrial output in the U.S.S.R. increased thirteen-fold.

Meanwhile, industrial production in most capitalist countries marked time and continues to mark time. True, in the U.S.A. industrial output rose two-fold in the period from 1929 to 1951. But this rise was due to arms production during the Second World War, to the predatory, aggressive war in Korea and to the militarization of the economy, that is, mainly to the manufacture of the means of destruction of human life.

What actually lies at the root of these two opposite lines of development? It is the operation of the law whereby the productive forces must necessarily correspond to the relations of production. In the capitalist countries the requisites of this law are violated, in the U.S.S.R. full scope is provided for its operation.

In the antagonistic socio-economic formations the relations of production lag behind—as is the case today, for

instance, in capitalist society—also because the reactionary classes, seeking to preserve and perpetuate the out-moded relations of production, the forms of ownership, exploitation and distribution of the national income, strive hard, and chiefly with the help of their state, to safeguard and protect these relations. As a result the relations of production lag behind the changes in the productive forces. This happened in all antagonistic social formations.

Hence the inevitable incongruity between the productive forces and relations of production, the inevitable contradictions between them, the probability, and in all pre-socialist formations the inevitability, of their conversion into direct opposites. In the course of historical development of all pre-socialist modes of production the development of the productive forces at a certain stage inevitably conflicted with the obsolescent relations of production, leading to violation of unity in the mode of production, causing production crises, economic upheavals, economic catastrophes, wars and social revolutions. In all pre-socialist formations contradictions and even conflicts between the productive forces and relations of production were inevitable, inavertible, independent of the will and consciousness of men, their wishes, their politics, and not only of the will and consciousness of individuals, but also of the will and consciousness of nations and entire classes.

In socialist society the relations of production likewise lag behind the development of the productive forces, since under the socialist system too the productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary element of production. However, the contradictions between the productive forces and relations of production which arise here cannot develop into opposites since the Communist Party and the Soviet Government, relying on the law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces, note the growing contradictions and adopt timely measures to surmount them, adapting the relations of production to the growth of the productive forces.

The relations of production cannot for too long lag behind the development of the productive forces. Sooner or later they must come into correspondence with the new productive forces. The violation of the correspondence, of the unity of the productive forces and the relations of production leads to a crisis of social production, to the destruction of the existing productive forces.

Hence, the content and essence of the law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character, level and state of the productive forces, consist in their intrinsic interconnection and interdependence, as expressed in that:

1. The productive forces, their state and character determine the nature and form of the relations of production.

2. First the productive forces change, and then, depending on this change and in conformity with it, men's relations of production change, that is, the character of the ownership of the means of production, the status, the place of the social groups in the process of production, their relations with one another, the relations of exchange and distribution.

3. Where the relations of production fully correspond to the character and state of the productive forces, the latter develop in full measure. The violation of this correspondence, the contradictions and conflicts which arise in antagonistic formations in consequence of the most mobile and revolutionary nature of the productive forces and the lag of the relations of production, lead to production crises, violation of the unity of production and the necessity of replacing the obsolescent relations of production by new ones, corresponding to the character of the new productive forces.

The distinctive feature of the operation of the law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces, and of other objective economic laws under socialism, is that they cease to operate here spontaneously, as a force alien and hostile to society. Under capitalism the laws operate spontaneously, their

objective existence coinciding with the spontaneity of their operation.

But under socialism economic laws, being objective, are no longer an elemental force counteracting men, society. Having cognized the objective laws of development of society, the Communist Party, the Soviet Government and socialist society conduct their activity in accordance with these laws and not contrary to them. Socialist society has been able to plan economic and social development in conformity with its interests and aims precisely because it relies on these cognized economic laws.

"It is said that economic laws are elemental in character, that their action is inavertible and that society is powerless against them. That is not true. That means making a fetish of laws, and oneself the slave of laws. It has been demonstrated that society is not powerless against laws, that, having come to know economic laws and relying upon them, society can restrict their sphere of action, utilize them in the interests of society and 'harness' them, just as in the case of the forces of nature and their laws...."*

The objective laws of development of society operate spontaneously if they have not been cognized or, even if cognized and discovered, they are ignored by society, its reactionary classes which act contrary to these laws, as is the case under capitalism.

In socialist society the policy of the Communist Party and the Socialist State relies on cognized economic laws. The policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet State is an organizing and guiding force because it is based on a profound study of the laws and requirements of development of the material life of society, on a thorough study and consideration of the processes taking place in the depths of the economic life of socialist society, on the study of the historical, creative activity of the masses, that is, of the tens

---

* J. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, Moscow 1953, p. 9.

of millions of builders of the new society. Thanks to this the Communist Party and the Soviet Government, relying on cognized objective laws of development of society, are able scientifically to predict the trends of further economic development. The knowledge of the laws of development of society, scientific prediction have always made it possible for the Communist Party consciously and confidently to govern the events.

Relying on the profound comprehension of the laws of development of socialist society and the study of new processes the Communist Party charts and scientifically defines the grand prospects of further gradual advance of the Soviet Union towards communism. Marxist-Leninist foresight is all-powerful since it is based on strict and thorough consideration of the objective laws of development of socialist society.

In socialist society socialist relations of production constitute the basis of the entire historical activity of Soviet people. Consequently, here new economic laws have begun to operate. With the appearance and triumph of the new economic relations in socialist society the economic laws which ensued from the specific nature of the capitalist mode of production became invalid. The old economic laws departed from the scene giving way to other laws which flowed from the nature of socialist ownership, socialist relations of production, friendly co-operation and mutual assistance of working people free from exploitation. For example, capitalist ownership of the means of production inevitably engenders exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, capitalist competition and anarchy of production, crises of overproduction, impoverishment of the working class, growing antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and irreconcilable class struggle between them.

As a result of the abolition of capitalist relations of production and their replacement by socialist relations of production the laws of capitalism became void and other

laws began to operate, such as the basic economic law of socialism, as well as the law of expanded socialist reproduction, the principle of payment according to work done. Competition which prevailed under capitalism has given way to socialist emulation. Instead of the law whereby under capitalism consumption (effective demand) lags behind production, in the U.S.S.R. consumption grows faster than production. Instead of the anarchy and competition of capitalist production there began to operate the law of balanced (proportionate) development of the national economy. Consequently, the laws that operated under capitalism have been superseded by new laws which stem from the new economic conditions.

At the same time, under socialism the operation of other laws, characteristic of capitalist economy, is restricted by the new conditions and new laws. In socialist society, for instance, the sphere of operation of the law of value is limited. It has ceased to act here as the regulator of production. Of the new specific laws, inherent in socialist society alone, the basic economic law of socialism discovered by J. V. Stalin is most significant.This law determines the operation of all other, non-fundamental economic laws of socialism.

The essence, the main features and requirements of the basic economic law of socialism is the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques.

The basic economic law of socialism reflects not only the aim, tasks and object of socialist production but indicates also the means of achieving them—continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques. This is what determines the essence of the economic system of socialist society and radically distinguishes it from the capitalist system.

Under capitalism the basic aim, object and motive force of development of production is the securing of the maximum

surplus value, the securing of the maximum profit (under monopoly capitalism) through the exploitation and plunder of the population of the given country and of the peoples of other countries. For the capitalists the working people and their requirements are but a means, a raw material which they can exploit, an instrument for achieving the main aim—the extraction of the maximum profit.

The capitalist does not care what he produces—woollen fabrics or castor-oil, bicycles or guns, fertilizer for agriculture or gunpowder, poison gas or agricultural machinery, automobiles or atom bombs. Moreover: capitalist monopolies find it more expedient to manufacture implements of war, means of human slaughter since this yields them the highest profits and is the best business. Hence—the militarization of the economy and the arms drive in the U.S.A. and other capitalist countries.

The aim and object of socialist production is to serve man, the labouring masses, the people with their manifold and constantly growing material and cultural requirements. Therein lies the superiority of socialist economy over capitalist economy, and its omnipotence. Therein lies the genuine humanism of the socialist social system in contrast to the brutal, anti-popular essence of capitalism. The ideology of socialist humanism expresses and reflects the basic economic law of socialism.

The basic economic law of capitalism exists objectively. It stems from the nature of capitalist relations of production, the essence of which it reflects.

The basic economic law of socialism likewise exists objectively. It reflects the essence of socialist relations of production and operates with the force of necessity, determining all the main aspects, the main processes of development of socialist production.

The operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism reveals the major processes of capitalist production, its booms and decline, its crises. The basic economic law of socialism conditions the continuity of socialist

production, its unprecedentedly high rate of development, its advantages and superiority over capitalist production.

The development of capitalist production, conditioned by the operation of its basic economic law, inevitably leads to absolute and relative impoverishment of the working people, deterioration of the entire life of the working man, to his conversion into an appendage of the machine. The impact of this law is even more telling in the conditions of imperialism.

It is the victory of the socialist mode of production in the U.S.S.R. that has put an end to the operation of the despotic economic laws of capitalism and ushered in the new economic laws inherent in socialist society.

The development of the socialist mode of production is inseparable from steady improvement of the material and cultural well-being of all working people.

Under capitalism technical progress is achieved by starving the personality of the worker, and even the pure light of science, as Marx put it, seems able to shine but on the dark background of ignorance, illiteracy and cultural backwardness to which capitalism dooms the popular masses. In contrast to this, technical progress under socialism takes place along with the rise of the cultural level of the working people, with the development of their manifold abilities, talents and endowments.

Under capitalism science and technique, knowledge and culture constitute a force which capital directs against the workers, against the working people: it becomes hostile to them as an instrument of exploitation and augmentation of capital. Contrary to this, under socialism, science and technique, knowledge and culture serve the working people; they are destined to lighten and do lighten labour, raise its productivity, elevate the power of man over the forces of nature.

The development of capitalism must inevitably deepen and sharpen the antagonism of the class interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of the peasants and the landlords,

inevitably sharpen the class struggle. This inavertibly leads to socialist revolution, to the collapse of the capitalist system and to its doom. The proletariat, in alliance with the toiling peasantry, is destined to carry out this great revolution. To this the toiling masses are impelled by the entire course of events, by the conditions of their life. The adventurist, anti-popular policy of the bourgeoisie, its betrayal of the national interests and its anti-democratism, hasten its doom. Such is the logic of history.

The bourgeoisie has trampled underfoot the principle of equal rights for men and nations, cast overboard the banner of bourgeois-democratic liberties, the banner of national independence and national sovereignty. The Communist and democratic parties have been called upon to raise and they do raise this banner. They are rallying and organizing the popular masses for the struggle against imperialist reaction, for the triumph of freedom and democracy.

The country of victorious socialism—the U.S.S.R.—is a guiding star for all peoples. The working people of all countries see that the world of capitalism is possessed of increasing contradictions and antagonisms, that it is suffering from internal instability and that the bourgeoisie cannot hope to get out of the mire into which capitalist society has sunk. At the same time in the U.S.S.R., under the socialist system, they witness steady progress, grand prospects for the development of the productive forces and efflorescence of socialist culture.

Two worlds—two diametrically opposite laws of development. These laws characterize all aspects of life of the two opposing social systems.

The development of capitalism signified and signifies the development and aggravation of the antithesis, of the gulf dividing town and country, mental and manual labour. The triumph of the socialist mode of production in the U.S.S.R. abolished this antithesis between mental and manual labour, between town and country.

At present essential distinctions between them remain. But the process of development of the socialist mode of production is leading to the elimination of these essential distinctions between mental and manual labour, between town and country. This is a condition and at the same time a reflection of the law-governed process of gradual transition from socialism to communism.

The process of elimination of the existing essential distinctions between mental and manual labour is reflected in the rising cultural and technical level of the masses, in the colossal growth of the network of schools and numerous courses, in the development of the powerful movement of innovators and foremost workers of socialist production. The introduction of universal, compulsory, ten-grade and polytechnical education, stipulated in the Fifth Five-Year Plan of the development of the U.S.S.R. for 1951-55, is an important and decisive measure designed to liquidate the still existing disparity in the cultural and technical level of various strata of Soviet society.

The complete elimination of essential distinctions between mental and manual labour, between town and country, will lead to the obliteration of the still existing boundary-lines between classes and social groups, that is, between the workers, collective farmers and the intelligentsia, and will strengthen still more the moral and political unity of Soviet society. This too constitutes the new historical law of development of socialist society.

Under capitalism there is growing wealth on the one pole and poverty on the other; the gulf between the classes widens, a bitter class struggle develops, rendering the capitalist system as a whole exceptionally unstable. Under socialism, on the contrary, the distinctions between the classes are obliterated, the moral and political unity of society is strengthened, it becomes mightier, stronger and more consolidated. These diametrically opposite laws of development are necessarily conditioned by the antagonistic modes of production. Under capitalism there is a descending

line of development, a decay and crisis of the entire system; under socialism we have an ascending line of development, a flourishing society, a steady advance towards communism.

SOURCE OF THE ORIGIN OF SOCIAL IDEAS

Historical materialism holds that social consciousness is a reflection of social being, a reflection of the conditions of material life of society. Whatever is the social being of men, whatever is their material life, such is their social consciousness. Just as consciousness is the outcome of nature, of matter, its reflection in the mind of men, so also social consciousness of men is the outcome and reflection of the conditions of material life of society. The material life of society, social being, is the primary and spiritual life the secondary, derivative.

The material life of society is objective reality, existing independently of the will of men, while the spiritual life of society, its social ideas, theories, religious, artistic and philosophical views are the reflection of objective reality, of social being. "...The source of formation of the spiritual life of society," wrote J. V. Stalin, "the origin of social ideas, social theories, political views and political institutions, should not be sought for in the ideas, theories, views and political institutions themselves, but in the conditions of the material life of society, in social being, of which these ideas, theories, views, etc., are the reflection."*

In the course of historical development there emerged and developed many varied forms of social consciousness: political and legal ideology, philosophy, science, religion, ethics, art and literature. One and the same social being finds its reflection in various forms of social consciousness.

Social consciousness, social ideas, whatever their form of manifestation, are not once and for all established and immutable phenomena. On the contrary, men's conscious-

---

* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1954, p. 725.

ness, social ideas, like social life itself, are in a state of continuous change and development.

During different periods of the history of society different social ideas, theories, views and political institutions are observed. If under the slave system we encountered certain social ideas, theories, views and political institutions, under feudalism others, and under capitalism others still, then under socialism, we have new social ideas, theories, views and political institutions, differing from those under all previous formations.

What causes the change and development of social consciousness and social ideas, what laws govern this change and development?

The causes for the change of social ideas, political theories and views and also the institutions which correspond to them should be sought for not in the nature of the ideas, views and institutions themselves but in the changed conditions of the material life of society.

The idealists regard social ideas, theories and views as something primary, primordial and independent of social being. Hence, they look for the causes of the changes of ideas, views and theories in the nature of these ideas themselves, regarding the development and change of social consciousness as a self-sufficing process. Hegel, for example, saw the causes of development of social consciousness in the development of an "absolute idea." He alleged that the change, the development of a certain "universal spirit" conditions the change, the development of human consciousness and of society as a whole. But such a view does not contain a grain of science since "universal spirit" and "absolute idea" are simply idealistic fiction invented by Hegel.

The Hegelian ". . . absolute idea—which is only absolute in so far as he (Hegel—*F.K.*) has absolutely nothing to say about it . . ."* says Engels. Like all idealists in the past and

* F. Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, Moscow 1950, p. 19.

present Hegel turns the relation of thought to being upside down, distorts the actual state of affairs. The idealists divorce thought and consciousness from the thinking and conscious people themselves. They consider thought and consciousness absolute, depict it as something self-sufficing, independent of the conditions of material life of society.

Another variety of idealists look for the source of development of social consciousness in the mysterious properties of the "national spirit" or in the mystical properties of the race. Thus, for example, the Hitlerites talked about "the genuine German spirit," about "the German Aryan soul" and its "specific" properties, distinct from those of other, "inferior" races. Nowadays the U.S.-British imperialists hold forth on the "specific" properties of the Anglo-Saxon race. The ideologists of American imperialism have invented the concept of the "American way of life" and correspondingly the "peculiar way of American thinking." But actually there never were, nor are there now, any invariable properties of the "national spirit" or "race spirit" in social life. History proves that the ideas and views of men and classes change under the influence of economic conditions. Moreover, in one and the same epoch various social classes, belonging to one and the same race and nation, hold opposing social ideas, theories, ideals, principles, political and legal views.

Thus, for example, the American imperialist bourgeoisie is instigating a third world war, which is accounted for by the economic nature of imperialism, by the basic economic law of modern capitalism. The drive for maximum profit inevitably urges the monopolists to unleash war, since war for them is the most profitable business. For this same reason the American bourgeoisie is the enemy of the national independence of the peoples, the enemy of peace and democracy. On the contrary, the working people of the U.S.A., like the peoples of other countries, are battling against imperialist wars, for wars bring the peoples nothing but misfortunes and suffering.

The views, ideals, principles and interests of antagonistic classes, belonging to one and the same nation or race, are antagonistic. The ideologists of the bourgeoisie seek to conceal, cloak this antagonism.

History also testifies that even one and the same social class, the bourgeoisie, for example, maintains different ideas, views and principles in different periods of its development. When, for instance, capitalism entered its final, imperialist stage of development there occurred a change in the ethics and philosophy of the bourgeoisie, in its views on democracy and freedom, on the national sovereignty of the peoples.

Previously, in the period of the ascending line of development of capitalism, the bourgeoisie could afford to be liberal, defend bourgeois-democratic liberties. In this way the young bourgeoisie made itself popular with the people. At present not a trace remains of its liberalism. It has become reactionary. The bourgeoisie has trampled underfoot the principle of equal rights for men and nations. The reactionary ideologists of the bourgeoisie now preach the liquidation of national sovereignty. Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars.

The causes of the change of the political, legal and other views of the bourgeoisie in different periods of history should be sought for not in the spiritual sphere but in the changed conditions of material life of society. As the saying goes, "Different times—different songs." The crisis of capitalism, the acuteness of its contradictions, instability and the drive for maximum profit, have prompted the monopoly bourgeoisie of today to throw overboard the bourgeois-democratic liberties and the principles of national sovereignty.

A definite economic system forms the basis of a given society, while the political, legal, religious, artistic and philosophical views of society and their corresponding institutions constitute the superstructure on this basis.

The distinguishing features of the basis of capitalist society are private capitalist ownership of the means of

production, relations of capitalist exploitation and oppression of the workers and a capitalist mode of distribution of products. The capitalist basis, like those of the slave and feudal systems, is by its very nature antagonistic—it is based on domination and subordination.

After the socialist revolution in Russia the capitalist basis was superseded by the socialist basis, the distinguishing features of which are social socialist ownership of the instruments of production, absence of exploitation of man by man, co-operation and mutual assistance of the free toilers of socialist society, and a socialist mode of distribution of products according to the quantity and quality of labour performed.

Like the basis the superstructure is of a historical character. Every historically determined economic basis originates a corresponding superstructure of the given society. The feudal basis has a feudal superstructure, that is, its social, political and other views and institutions, the capitalist basis has its own, capitalist superstructure and the socialist basis its socialist superstructure, corresponding to and conditioned by it.

Consequently, the distinguishing feature of the superstructure is that it is the product of one epoch in the course of which the given economic basis exists and operates. Due to this the superstructure is not enduring, existing but one epoch; a historically determined superstructure is eliminated and disappears with the elimination of the given basis.

Thus, it is the change of the economic basis that causes the change of spiritual life of society, of its social ideas, political, legal, religious, esthetic and philosophical views and theories as well as of its moral principles.

In the times of chattel-slavery the ruling landlord class treated the peasants like cattle. The landlord had the right to sell his serf, to lose him at cards or barter him for a dog, to flog him to death. The savage, inhuman treatment of the peasant toiler reflected the feudal economic system of that society.

In contemporary capitalist society the Malthusian racists propagate their notorious theory of the need to exterminate people by means of atomic and bacteriological warfare. This is not only exempt from punishment, but is even encouraged by the bourgeoisie and its state. In the U.S.A. the white people and the Negroes do not enjoy equal rights. There, coloured people are not allowed to travel in the same car with white people, to live in the same house or to stay in the same hotel; the capitalists and their henchmen may lynch and murder Negroes with impunity.

In the land of socialism the advocacy of war, of race or national inequality is considered a crime punishable by law. Thus the distinction between socialist economy and capitalist economy determines the difference in the predominant views.

Social consciousness, wrote Marx, can never be anything but cognized being. Even the fantastic religious images and concepts of men are a reflection, even if false and distorted, but nevertheless a reflection, of the conditions of their material life.

Bourgeois ideology gives a distorted picture of the social relations of people. However, bourgeois ideology too is a reflection of the conditions of the material life of bourgeois society and is born of the economic system of capitalism, its basis.

The conditions of the material, economic life of people are reflected in their social consciousness. But how these conditions are reflected in the minds of people depends on the level of social development, on the economic system of society and on the nature and status of the classes in the consciousness of which social being is reflected. The vulgarizers and simplists deduce political, legal, religious, artistic and philosophical ideas and institutions corresponding to them directly from the level of the productive forces or even from the level of the technique. Marxism-Leninism has always fought against this vulgarization of historical materialism, holding that the source of the origin of social,

political, legal, religious and other ideas should be sought for primarily in the economy of society.

At the early stages of social development the dependence of social consciousness on the conditions of material life of society, and, in the first place, on the economic system of society, can be traced more easily inasmuch as mental labour at that time was not yet divorced from manual labour. Then the process of reproduction of social life represented a kind of uniform, integral and indissoluble phenomenon. The spiritual activity of people there, said Marx, was, so to say, intertwined with the material life of society.

With the lapse of time, as antagonistic classes appeared and mental labour became divorced from manual labour, social life, including the spiritual life of people, became more involved. There appeared the state and with it law; political, legal, religious, esthetic and philosophical views arose, and institutions corresponding to them. The reflection of the conditions of material life in the minds of people became a far more complex process. Here too the change of ideological forms was determined by the economic basis of society, but ideology, having arisen on the basis of the given economic system, became relatively independent of the economic basis which had generated it.

The predominance of economic relations over ideological relations is indisputable, says Engels. However, simultaneously he pointed out that "... it comes to pass within conditions imposed by the particular sphere itself: in philosophy, for instance, through the operation of economic influences (which again generally only act under political, etc., disguises) upon the existing philosophic material handed down by predecessors."*

The philosophy of every epoch proceeds from the conceptions it inherits from its predecessors.

The ideologists of the ruling classes, in elaborating political and legal theories, philosophical systems and

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, Russ. ed., State Publishing House, 1947, p. 430.

esthetic forms, use, as a point of departure, the material accumulated in the given sphere by their predecessors and rely on this material. However, at every given historical moment they proceed—consciously or unconsciously, overtly or covertly—from the interests of their class and in the last analysis from its economic interests. This too is a manifestation of the predominance of economic relations over ideology.

There is a definite historical continuity in the development of such forms of ideology as, for example, philosophy, art, ethics and religion. In Russia the philosophical materialistic tradition was passed on from Lomonosov and Radishchev to Herzen and Belinsky and then to Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. In literature and art there is a continuity interlinking the works of Griboyedov, Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Turgenev, Tolstoy, Glinka, Dargomyzhsky, Musorgsky, Borodin and Chaikovsky.

There exists also a hereditary bond between Russian classical literature and art and Soviet literature and art. Though Soviet socialist art is different in principle from the old art, including Russian classical art, qualitatively new in social essence, the hereditary bond between them remains.

Hence, Marxism-Leninism holds that in creating and developing new socialist art it is essential critically to assimilate the great cultural heritage of the past, the treasury of progressive Russian classical art, as well as of the art of other nations.

* * *

The art of the Renaissance, the great works of Pushkin and Lermontov, Gogol, Tolstoy, Repin, Surikov, Glinka and Chaikovsky, far from disappearing with the liquidation of the old basis which produced them, have, following the socialist revolution, on the contrary, become accessible to millions and continue to accord the greatest delight.

In his article *L. N. Tolstoy* V. I. Lenin wrote that in tsarist Russia Leo Tolstoy was known to only an insignificant minority of the population. "To make his great works really accessible to *all*, it is necessary to fight and fight

against the social system which has condemned millions and tens of millions to ignorance, oppression, slavish toil and poverty; a social revolution is needed."*

This great foresight of V. I. Lenin found real embodiment in the triumph of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

What V. I. Lenin said of Tolstoy's works is also true of great Russian literature as a whole, of the great Russian classical art as well as of the great works of art of the peoples of the U.S.S.R.; it likewise applies to the treasures of world classical art; to the works of Shakespeare and Balzac, Beethoven and Bizet, Chopin and Liszt, Goethe and Heine. It is the socialist revolution and the socialist system that have made the great and immortal works of classical art accessible to tens and hundreds of millions of working people, that have placed art at the service of the people.

The Communist Party is waging a ruthless struggle against all who regard with disdain the great classical heritage of Russian and world art, as well as against those who kowtow to the depraved bourgeois culture of today.

In its class essence socialist ideology is radically different from the entire preceding ideology, but it too draws on the cultural heritage of the past.

When analyzing the origin and development of social consciousness and elucidating its interconnection with the economic system of society, it is also essential to take into account the interaction of various ideological forms: ethics and religion, ethics and legal consciousness, ethics and art, art and philosophy and so forth. For instance, religion and philosophy influenced moral development; development of idealistic philosophy was influenced by religion; philosophy and religion influenced art. It is particularly essential to take into account the tremendous influence exerted by political and legal views and the institutions corresponding to them on philosophy, science, art, ethics and religion.

Only a thorough consideration of this interaction makes

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Articles on Tolstoy*, Moscow 1953, p. 17.

it possible properly to understand the complex process of the development of social consciousness, of the spiritual life of every class and of society as a whole.

In contrast to this the vulgarizers of Marxism, the adherents of economic materialism, endeavoured to represent ideology as a direct outcome of the level of production. They simplified and misrepresented the relation between the ideological forms and the productive forces of society. They failed to understand that the changes in the level of development of the productive forces are reflected in ideology not directly but indirectly—through the refraction of these changes in the economic basis. They also disregarded the interdependence of the forms of social consciousness, the influence of the state and its policy on all forms of social consciousness. Regarding ideological forms as a direct outcome of the level of development of the productive forces they were frequently baffled by such phenomena as the efflorescence of art in ancient Greece or in the epoch of the Renaissance, of Russian literature and art in the first half of the XIXth century. The level of development of the productive forces, the slave society of ancient Greece, for example, was inferior to feudal society but the level of development of art in ancient Greece was higher than that in the feudal society of the Middle Ages.

In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* Marx and Engels pointed out that capitalism had ensured a tremendous leap in the development of the productive forces of society; however Marx noted that "... capitalist production is hostile to certain branches of spiritual production of which art and poetry are a part."

The explanation for this definite non-conformity between the periods of efflorescence of certain forms of art and the periods of development of production should be sought for in the material conditions of life of society, in the economic system of the given society.

At first it might appear that there was inexplicable incongruity in the first half of the XIXth century between

the level of development of production in Russia and the powerful development of its classical literature and art. In those days Russia was an economically backward country, a country of serfdom, of tsarist despotism, arbitrary rule and violence. With the exception of a small section of the gentry and raznochintsy (intellectuals) almost the entire population of Russia was illiterate. And this country produced a great literature, a brilliant constellation of outstanding poets, writers and critics: Pushkin, Lermontov, Griboyedov, Rileyev, Herzen, Ogarev, Gogol, Goncharov, Turgenev, Dostoyevsky, Nekrasov, Belinsky, Dobrolyubov, Chernyshevsky, Saltykov-Shchedrin and others. In the middle of the past century there emerged the genius of L. N. Tolstoy whose works marked a whole epoch, a new step in the esthetic development of mankind. In no country in the world has literature flourished so splendidly and exerted such powerful ideological influence on the course of social development.

Does this conflict with the materialist concept of social life? Of course not. This natural phenomenon contradicts but the views of the vulgar "economic materialists."

Advanced Russian classical literature was the ideological expression of the conflict between the new productive forces which had matured in the womb of feudal society and the outmoded relations of feudal ownership (the feudal relations of production) which hampered the further development of the productive forces and of society as a whole. The nonconformity between the old relations of production and the character of the new productive forces was the economic cause of the sharpening in Russia of the class struggle between the peasants and landlords. The uprising of the Decembrists (December 14, 1825) was an attempt on the part of the advanced Russians of those days—revolutionaries from among the gentry—to overthrow tsarism and serfdom. But the attempt failed because the Decembrists were cut off from the people, and reaction increased still more.

In these conditions classical literature, along with the materialist philosophy of the great revolutionary democrats

—Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov—was an important means through which advanced Russian people expressed the material and political requirements of the day and the outlook of the advanced social forces, reflecting also the class struggle of the peasantry against serfdom and tsarism. The grandeur of Russian classical literature of the XIXth century consisted precisely in that it loudly and in incomparable artistic form voiced the thoughts, expectations and hopes of the foremost forces of society, and also of the suffering, oppressed people—the driving force of progressive development in Russia. Russian classical literature appeared and blossomed first of all as a force directed against serfdom. Its profound source should be sought for in the economic and political contradictions of Russia of those days, in the implacable hatred of the peasants for serfdom and for the landlords who exploited and enslaved them. The great Russian classical literature and art of the XIXth century voiced the protest of the advanced forces of Russian society and, above all, of the peasantry, against serfdom and tsarism. Their distinguishing feature was their popular character. Therein, in the first place, lay the everlasting potency of Russian classical literature and art.

There were also other factors which stimulated the development of Russian classical literature and art in the XIXth century. In 1812 Russia was invaded by the Napoleon hordes. The entire nation, headed by the leading Russians of those days, rose in defence of the country. The rout of the arrogant foe before whom all Western Europe trembled evoked a wave of national consciousness, a feeling of national pride, which substantially fertilized Russian literature.

Consequently, in order to understand any given ideological phenomena, their social roots and sources, it is necessary to proceed not merely from the level of development of the productive forces but from the economic system of the given society, from the relations between the productive forces and relations of production, from whether they correspond or

disagree and from the struggle of the classes and the concrete conditions of the epoch.

The source of new, progressive ideas should be sought for in the conflict between the new productive forces and the old relations of production, in the urgent necessity of abolishing the obsolete relations of production and of replacing them by new relations of production corresponding to the new productive forces. Incongruity between the new productive forces and the obsolescent economic system of society is the economic basis of all social conflicts, of acute class struggle and social revolutions.

The history of capitalism knows quite a number of examples of economically backward countries playing a leading role in the sphere of ideology in relation to the economically more advanced countries. In the middle of the XIXth century Germany, for example, was economically more backward than England and France. But Germany became the mother country of the most revolutionary ideology, of the greatest teaching—Marxism. This was due to the following conditions and causes. In the Germany of those days the feudal relations of production did not correspond to the new, developing productive forces. On this basis a bourgeois-democratic revolution matured which—and this is particularly significant—was bound to take place under more favourable conditions than in England in the XVIIth century and in France in the XVIIIth century. In 1848 there already existed an organized working class in Germany. Given favourable conditions, the bourgeois-democratic revolution there might have grown into a socialist revolution. This was exactly why Germany became the motherland of Marxism and the leaders of the German working class its creators.

Leninism, being Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, came into existence in Russia, in a country which, in level of development of the productive forces, was not advanced either. But Leninism appeared in Russia in the period of the extreme sharpening of all contra-

dictions of world imperialism, when the "flourishing," "old" capitalism turned into monopoly, decaying capitalism, when the proletarian revolution was on the order of the day.

At the end of the XIXth and the beginning of the XXth century Russia was the knot of contradictions of world imperialism. It was a country where economic, political and national oppression was exceptionally violent, where all the contradictions of imperialism were particularly pronounced and acute. But there was in Russia a great force—the most revolutionary force in the world—the Russian working class and its ally, the toiling peasantry. This was a force capable of solving all the contradictions in a revolutionary way. At the beginning of the XXth century Russia was on the eve of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. A real possibility existed in Russia for the bourgeois-democratic revolution to grow into a socialist revolution. That is why Russia and not some other country was the motherland of Leninism and why V. I. Lenin, the leader of the Russian working class, became its creator.

A profound analysis of the historical roots of Leninism ensures a correct approach to the study of the causes and conditions of the origin and development of new forms of social consciousness, ideas and political theories.

The revisionists, the falsifiers of Marxism tried and still try (in Western Germany, for example) idealistically to distort the Marxist teaching on the relations between social being and social consciousness. They are "correcting" Marxism, alleging that social being is identical with social consciousness. But social being and social consciousness are not identical. Social consciousness reflects social being, material life. It would appear at first that the most distinguishing feature of social life is precisely consciousness in contrast to nature where blind forces operate, where no conscious goal exists. In society there act men endowed with reason, consciousness and will; here nothing is accomplished without the participation of reason, desire and will since people set themselves definite aims and work for their

realization. The fact that it is men endowed with consciousness and will who act in history, that all historic events are accompanied by a battle of ideas, that men, classes struggle for the realization of definite aims gives rise to the illusion that consciousness and ideas are the primary, determining cause and the main motive force of development of society. Idealism utilizes this illusion in its fight against the scientific, materialist interpretation of history. In doing so it resorts to sophistry, identifying social being with social consciousness.

The idealistic view on the relations between the material and the ideal, social being and social consciousness found its reflection also in the revisionist literature which offers bourgeois idealistic trash under the guise of Marxism. This is what the Austrian social-democrat Max Adler and the Russian Machian A. Bogdanov used to do. Other revisionists also endeavoured to "prove" the identity of social being and social consciousness.

V. I. Lenin smashed this subjective-idealistic identification of social being and social consciousness. He showed that social being and social consciousness can never be identical. Social consciousness is always, under all circumstances and in all social formations, but a reflection of social being. And apart from everything else the changes of social being are reflected in social consciousness only after they have taken effect.

The new productive forces and relations of production originated not out of the deliberate, conscious activity of people, but spontaneously, unconsciously, independently of the will of men, although effected by men endowed with consciousness and will. This was due to two reasons. Firstly, because people are not free to choose one mode of production or another. As every new generation enters life it finds productive forces and relations of production already existing as the result of the activity of former generations. Secondly, the new productive forces and relations of production originated spontaneously also because, when improving

the implements of production, one or another element of the productive forces, people were not conscious of the social consequences of these innovations. Their consciousness did not usually go beyond their immediate every-day interests.

When, for example, Russian and foreign capitalists implanted modern machine industry in Russia, they, of course, did not know what social consequence this extensive growth of the productive forces would lead to, they did not realize that this would lead to such a re-grouping of social forces that would enable the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, to accomplish the victorious October Socialist Revolution. The capitalists simply wanted to expand industrial production and obtain higher profits.

Only when new productive forces emerge and when a conflict arises between these productive forces and the old relations of production does spontaneous development give way to conscious activity of the advanced social forces, peaceful development to forcible upheaval, evolution to revolution. Prior to socialism this was the case in all social formations.

"Every individual producer in the world economic system realizes," V. I. Lenin wrote, "that he is introducing a certain change into the technique of production; every owner realizes that he exchanges certain products for others; but these producers and these owners do not realize that in doing so they are thereby changing *social being*. The sum-total of these changes in all their ramifications in the capitalist world economy could not be grasped even by seventy Marxes. The paramount thing is that the *laws* of these changes have been discovered, that the *objective* logic of these changes and their historical development have at bottom and in the main been disclosed.... The fact that you live and conduct your business, beget children, produce products and exchange them, gives rise to an objectively necessary chain of events, a chain of development, which is independent of your *social* consciousness, and is never grasped by the latter completely. The highest task of humanity is

to comprehend this objective logic of economic evolution (the evolution of social life) in its general and fundamental features, so that it may be possible to adapt *to it* one's social consciousness and the consciousness of the advanced classes of all capitalist countries in as definite, clear and critical a fashion as possible."*

This scientific "logic of economic evolution" of capitalism was first discovered by Marxism.

The ideologists of the bourgeoisie—the bourgeois economists—failed to perceive the real nature of the capitalist mode of production and capitalist society because their class interests and class narrow-mindedness made them regard the historically transient social form as being eternal, natural and supra-historical. They could not discern behind the relations of things—commodities—the relations of people. Bourgeois ideologists are in the power of commodity fetishism. They attribute to things and products of human activity supra-sensuous, mystical properties.

This fetishism, this false viewpoint, inherent in capitalist society, bourgeois ideologists extend to the entire domain of social relations: to the relations of economy and politics, economy and law, being and consciousness. Bourgeois ideology represents these relations in a false topsy-turvy way. The historical course of development of capitalism led to its internal contradictions becoming more profound and acute. And the more the bourgeoisie became entangled in contradictions, the more falsely was capitalist society portrayed by bourgeois "science" and bourgeois ideology and the greater was the mysticism into which the bourgeoisie lapsed.

In the present-day conditions of the general crisis of capitalism the bourgeoisie and its ideologists consider that their main task in the sphere of ideology is not to disclose the truth but to conceal it; they endeavour to give out black for white, evil for good and falsehood for truth.

* V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow 1952, pp. 338-39.

Under capitalism, because of its antagonistic nature and anarchy of production, it is not men that dominate the process of production but, on the contrary, it is the process of production that dominates men. The capitalist mode of production, which is the foundation of bourgeois society, originated as a result of the spontaneous operation of the laws of commodity economy. The wider commodity-capitalist relations developed, the more people and countries these relations involved and the more profoundly they penetrated all branches of the economic life of each country, the more did people lose their power over their relations of production and at the same time over other social relations. They became slaves of the products of their own activity. This found expression in anarchy of production, crises of overproduction, colossal growth of unemployment and in the destruction of the productive forces created by men.

The growing chaos and insoluble contradictions engendered by the capitalist system induce the ideologists of the bourgeoisie to invent savage reactionary theories of overpopulation, of the permanent nature and expediency of wars and of the necessity to abolish national sovereignty, etc.

The class nature of the imperialists and their ideologists prevents them from drawing the proper conclusion that the very system of capitalism is rotten and must be replaced by another which would correspond to the contemporary character of the productive forces. This conclusion can be drawn only by the advanced class of our days—the working class. The bourgeoisie and its ideologists seek a way out of the antagonistic contradictions of modern capitalism in new wars, that is, in new calamities for humanity.

No hurricane, drought, flood, plague, earthquake or any other elemental disaster caused by the forces of nature can be compared with the calamities brought on humanity by the elemental forces of capitalism and by the entire activity of imperialist reaction. Anarchy, spontaneity, an antagonistic and destructive character of development are inherent in the very nature of capitalism.

"Under capitalism the even economic growth of individual enterprises, or individual states, is impossible. Under capitalism, there are no other means of restoring the periodically disturbed equilibrium than crises in industry and wars in politics."*

The attempts to "plan" capitalist economy express the desire of bourgeois politicians to surmount the growing internal contradictions of capitalism, but simultaneously they indirectly attest the social nature of the modern productive forces which have outgrown the framework of capitalist relations of production and capitalist private ownership. Today's vast productive forces and the private ownership of the means of production are incompatible. Until this contradiction between the social character of production and private appropriation is eliminated there will exist anarchy, antagonism, crises, the destruction of already existing productive forces, the danger of imperialist wars and increasing suffering for millions of working people.

The modern imperialist bourgeoisie is no longer able to cope with the forces it had generated against its will. It has grossly miscalculated in estimating the social effect of its activity and the trend of historical development. Historical development in the past 37 years has in no way justified its expectations. Here we again see the specific feature inherent in antagonistic formations and particularly manifest in modern capitalism: the divergence between the aims and tasks which the ruling classes and their political leaders and ideologists set themselves and the results they achieve. Tracing the course of spontaneous social development Frederick Engels pointed out that here the desired end is rarely achieved, "... in the majority of instances the numerous desired ends cross and conflict with one another, or these ends themselves are from the outset incapable of realization or the means of attaining them are

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part 2, Moscow 1952, p. 416.

insufficient. Thus the conflicts of innumerable individual wills and individual actions in the domain of history produce a state of affairs entirely analogous to that prevailing in the realm of unconscious nature. The ends of the actions are intended, but the results which actually follow from these actions are not intended; or when they do seem to correspond to the end intended, they ultimately have consequences quite other than those intended."*

Take, for example, the events of recent years still fresh in our memory. Did only the imperialists of fascist Germany, Japan and their allies miscalculate when they organized and unloosed World War II in order to establish their world domination? No, the ruling classes of the U.S.A. and Britain who had fostered German fascism, armed and levelled it against the land of socialism also miscalculated. Because of their class hatred for the U.S.S.R. they could not properly calculate and appraise the significance of the economic, political and military might of the Soviet Union. Nor could they appraise and foresee the power and significance of the liberation and anti-fascist movement of the popular masses during World War II. These elements substantially "amended" the strategic, military and political calculations of the ruling circles in the Anglo-Saxon countries.

In a number of countries in Europe and Asia the popular anti-fascist movement brought about the victory of people's democracy, activized the masses in all countries, vastly increased the influence of the ideas of socialism and of the Communist and workers parties, tremendously enhanced the prestige of the great land of socialism in the eyes of the peoples of the world and the influence of the U.S.S.R. in international affairs.

From World War I capitalism emerged weakened, having lost the largest country in Europe—Russia—which

---

* F. Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, Moscow 1950, pp. 71-72.

had taken the path of socialist development. Unleashing World War II international reaction hoped to weaken the land of socialism and consolidate capitalism. But the opposite happened: the forces of reaction grew weaker while the forces of socialism and democracy grew and gained strength. This, of course, was very unpleasant for the bourgeoisie, something it did not, naturally, contemplate and which was not in the reckoning of its eminent representatives—the "chieftains" of the capitalist world.

Today, world reaction is becoming more and more enmeshed in contradictions, in the consequences of its own home and foreign policy. In striving to suppress the national-liberation movement and the revolutionary labour movement in Europe, Asia and Africa U.S.-British imperialist reaction has evoked the implacable hatred of the peoples of the world. Reaction is sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind. Such is the logic of things. The economic and political results registered by the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries and above all in its leading countries—U.S.A. and Britain—testify more and more to its political bankruptcy.

Present-day monopoly capitalism cannot exist without intensifying the exploitation of its own people, without periodically re-dividing the world by means of war, without imperialist expansion, without enslaving other nations and strangling their freedom and independence. The antagonistic nature of capitalism, the conflict between the vast modern productive forces and the obsolete, historically outmoded capitalist relations of production, and the selfish interests of the magnates of monopoly capital who strive at any cost, even at the price of monster catastrophes and havoc, to preserve their maximum profits—all this threatens the very existence of present-day civilization.

In preparing a third world war imperialist reaction, headed by the U.S.A., is imperilling the great cultural gains of humanity. Only the struggle of the broad masses for peace, against war, the consistent peace policy of the Soviet

Government and fear of the might of the U.S.S.R. hold the forces of imperialist reaction in rein.

Only with the abolition of capitalist relations of production does planned, conscious organization of the entire social life become possible. The very course of development of capitalism paves the way to the transition from capitalist society with its spontaneous character of development to socialist society, where spontaneity gives way to conscious, planned organization of social production.

Having disclosed the essence of the monopoly stage of capitalism Lenin concluded as far back as World War I that imperialism is moribund capitalism and that social development must inevitably lead to socialism. On the eve of the October Revolution he wrote: "The objective process of development is such that it is *impossible* to advance from *monopolies* (and the war has magnified their number, role and importance ten-fold) without advancing towards socialism."*

The entire history of society as well as the present state of affairs in the capitalist world and in socialist society convincingly illustrate the connection between social ideas, between all ideological forms without exception (political and legal ideology, ethics, religion, art, philosophy) and the character of the economic system. The reactionary character of bourgeois ideology reflects the decay of capitalism. The decaying economy of the capitalist world brings forth a rotten, reactionary ideology, aggressive political views, corrupt bourgeois morals, decadent art and literature and arrant idealistic philosophy.

But alongside of the bourgeoisie there has arisen a new, advanced class—the proletariat—the bearer of new, socialist relations of production. Advanced, socialist ideology harmonizes with the status and interests of this class. This ideology has fully triumphed in the U.S.S.R. where it has become the ideology of the whole of Soviet society.

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part I, Moscow 1951, p. 156.

In the land of socialism, where the conditions of material life of society have radically changed and where the socialist system has been established, the consciousness of the people, their ethics, psychology and spiritual physiognomy have also changed.

The teaching of historical materialism that social consciousness and social ideas are conditioned by the economic system of society is of the greatest practical value to the working class and its party.

The example of the U.S.S.R. shows that revolutionary struggle, the abolition of the reactionary capitalist economic system and its replacement by a socialist economic system are precisely the conditions required for the elimination of the reactionary bourgeois consciousness, of its depraved morals, reactionary political ideas and theories and for the inculcation of advanced socialist ideas and institutions, ethics, ideals and principles.

From here there also follows the corresponding conclusion for the working class of the capitalist countries, waging a struggle against capitalism and its reactionary bourgeois ideology, against its propagation of misanthropy, predatory wars and mysticism. Since reactionary bourgeois consciousness, corrupt bourgeois morals and ideas are determined by the conditions of material life of society, then, in order to eliminate, abolish these corrupt ideas and morals, it is necessary thoroughly to change the conditions of life of people in capitalist society which generates these reactionary ideas, views, theories, teachings and morals.

It is necessary to create conditions of social life which are worthy of human beings and which conform with the present-day level and character of the productive forces of society. These conditions are created by socialist society. And the way to achieve this is the class struggle of the proletariat, socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the working class.

CLASS CHARACTER OF IDEOLOGY, OF SOCIAL IDEAS IN ANTAGONISTIC SOCIETY

In a society divided into hostile, antagonistic classes there cannot exist non-class political or legal views, non-class or super-class ideology, ethics, philosophy, art and literature. This is what historical materialism teaches us. Ever since society became divided into hostile classes, into oppressors and oppressed, exploiters and exploited, ideology has always borne a class character. And the dominant ideology of society has always been that of the economically dominant class. The ideology of the dominant class is part of the superstructure on the economic basis. Its mission is to safeguard the interests of the dominant class, to consolidate its economic and political rule.

"The ideas of the ruling class," Marx and Engels wrote, "are in every epoch the ruling ideas.... The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of material production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships...."*

The truth of these words is confirmed by the entire history of class society. Thus, under the slave system, for example, the ideology of the slave-owning class dominated. This ideology openly upheld inequality of people, considering slavery a natural phenomenon. Even Zeus, according to ancient Greek mythology, enjoined the slaves to remain slaves. Aristotle, ideologist and advocate of the slave system, wrote that some people are free by their very nature while others are slaves and that it is useful and just for the latter to remain slaves. The slaves, on the contrary, considered

---

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. IV, pp. 36-37.

slavery to be unjust and fought against it. The famous insurrection of the slaves under the leadership of Spartacus is an instance.

In the present epoch the ideologists of the contemporary slave-owners—the bourgeoisie—proclaim hired slavery the only possible, just and allegedly natural form of social organization. The bourgeoisie and its ideologists brand as a crime the sacred struggle of the working class against its exploiters.

The ideology of the bourgeoisie and that of the proletariat are diametrically opposite. This reflects the cardinal difference of their standing in production, in the economic system of capitalist society. There the bourgeoisie is the monopoly owner of the means of production; it exploits the working class and is the dominant force. The working class, on the contrary, is deprived of the means of production, it lives by selling its labour power, is subjected to ruthless exploitation and is in the position of an oppressed and subordinated class. Inasmuch as the status of the proletariat in production and society crosses with that of the bourgeoisie their interests too are cardinally different and irreconcilable.

They are two antagonistic classes. To this corresponds the antithesis of proletarian and bourgeois ideology. Bourgeois ideology conforms with the status and interests of the bourgeoisie. Socialist, that is, the Marxist ideology corresponds to the standing and interests of the proletariat.

Inasmuch as the bourgeoisie is the economically dominant class, its ideology is also dominant in capitalist society. The dominant ideas of this society justify and uphold bourgeois ownership of the means of production, the exploitation of working people and the foundations and principles of capitalism. The bourgeoisie ensures the domination of its ideas and its ideology by monopolizing not only the means of material production but also the means of spiritual production and dissemination of ideas (the school, church, publishing houses, printing shops, press, radio, theatre, etc.).

The oppressed, exploited and indigent classes are deprived or almost deprived of all this under capitalism. Besides life in capitalist society is for a certain time totally permeated with the ideas of the bourgeoisie. These ideas are forced on the subjugated classes from childhood in the school, church, cinema, through the press, radio and the entire complex system of spiritual suppression of the labouring masses by the exploiters. Behind the ideology of the bourgeoisie stands tradition, force of habit. And reactionary tradition hallowed by time is a terrible and conservative force.

The ideology of the dominant class prevails, however, only for a certain time, until, within the old society new productive forces mature and come into conflict with the obsolete relations of production. The conflict between the productive forces and relations of production constitutes the economic basis of social revolution. On this economic basis an acute class struggle develops and progressive ideas emerge, reflecting the interests and requirements of the new, revolutionary social classes. The new ideas penetrate the masses, rally and organize them against the outmoded economic system, the exploiting ruling class and its ideology. The class struggle inevitably culminates in the overthrow of the rule of the reactionary, exploiting class.

Ancient history abounds with class struggle. It became particularly acute when the newly matured productive forces came into conflict with the obsolete relations of production of the slave system. The transition from slave society to feudal society entailed profound changes in the economic and political system of society, in social ideas and in the content of social consciousness. Along with the change of social ideas there occurred a change in the correlation of the forms of social consciousness.

In ancient society alongside religion a dominant role was played by political ideology; philosophy and art were also prominent. At the closing stage of the slave system, in the period of its decline, religion advanced to the forefront,

becoming under feudalism the dominant force: in Europe it was Christianity, in the East—Buddhism and Islam. All other ideological forms—ethics, art, science and philosophy —became subordinated to religion. "... The church was the supreme embodiment and sanction of the existing feudal system,"* wrote Engels.

The ideas of Christianity, Buddhism and Islam aimed at justifying the feudal relations of production, the economic basis of feudal society and, consequently, the yoke of serfdom. Christianity, as is known, commended the monarchist system, proclaiming bloody despots—the tsars, kings and emperors—God's anointed regents.

Persecution of the dissenters—the so-called heretics—and scientists by the secular and church authorities constitutes one of the bloodiest pages in the history of feudalism. Under the "sacred" Christian inquisition hundreds of thousands of innocent victims were tortured and put to death at the stakes and in dungeons.

In capitalist society bourgeois ideology manifests itself principally in open political and legal form. Engels called legal ideology specifically bourgeois. But the bourgeoisie has also made use of all other forms of ideology, including religion—the tried weapon of spiritual subjection of the masses—partly reforming it (Protestantism, Calvinism) and partly preserving its traditional form (Catholicism, Orthodoxy).

Nowadays, the official church, particularly the Catholic Church, upholds and justifies all the bloody crimes perpetrated by the American and British imperialists. The Catholic Church, and particularly the Vatican, is the inspirer of imperialist reaction in both the military-political and ideological fields.

The role and significance of the bourgeoisie as a class and its ideology in the development of society should be

---

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. VIII, p. 128.

considered from the historical standpoint. At one time, the ideologists of the bourgeoisie denounced serfdom and class inequality and, as has already been mentioned, demanded equality of all people before the law. The political slogan of the ascending bourgeoisie was the slogan of bourgeois democracy—"liberty, equality and fraternity."

Here is how V. I. Lenin characterized the ideologists of the ascending bourgeoisie in contrast to their contemporary reactionary offsprings. "... It should be said," wrote V. I. Lenin, "that quite frequently the word (bourgeois—*F.K.*) is interpreted most incorrectly, narrowly and anti-historically, being linked with (*without any regard to the historical epoch*) selfish defence of the interests of the minority. We must not forget that in the days of the enlighteners of the XVIIIth century (commonly referred to as the leaders of the bourgeoisie), of our enlighteners from the forties to the sixties, all the social problems boiled down to the struggle against serfdom and its survivals. The new socio-economic relations and the contradictions between them were then still in their infancy. Hence, in those days no self-seeking interests were displayed by the ideologists of the bourgeoisie; on the contrary, in the West as well as in Russia they fully believed in common weal and sincerely desired it, they were honestly unaware of (and partially could not then as y t see) the contradictions in the system arising out of serfdom."*

The modern monopoly bourgeoisie and its ideologists have renounced the things they saluted in the heyday of bourgeois rule. No wonder people say that had Jefferson, one of the authors of the Constitution of the U.S.A., appeared in present-day America he would have been placed on trial for un-American activity. The reactionary bourgeoisie now persecutes even those who advocate moderate democratic views, who fight for the observance of rights inscribed in bourgeois constitutions.

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 2, p. 473.

The modern imperialist bourgeoisie and its ideologists uphold their selfish class, anti-popular and anti-national interests, advocate and uphold reaction.

The imperialist, predatory war waged by German fascism and Japanese imperialism (1939-45), their sanguinary crimes in Europe and Asia, their policy of enslavement and annihilation of entire nations, the practice of implanting slavery and their insane attempts to establish world domination of the so-called "superior" Aryan race, that is German imperialism, most forcibly manifested the reactionary nature of the ideology of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The cherished dream of Japanese imperialism was to dominate Asia.

Following the defeat of German and Japanese imperialism by the Soviet army the U.S. bourgeoisie assumed the role of promoters of reaction in all fields. Particularly, atrocious crimes were committed by U.S. imperialism in Korea.

All the forces of obscurantism, fanaticism and reaction have been mobilized for the fight against Marxism, against communism. Anti-communism is, essentially, the content and trend of bourgeois ideology. The bourgeoisie resorts to medieval, fulsome trash. Scholasticism, mysticism, religion, the racialist theory and savage chauvinism, the mercenary yellow press and decadent bourgeois art—these are the spiritual weapons of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie and its ideologists in the U.S.A. and Britain cultivate such savage and frantic reactionary theories as the theory of the overpopulation of the globe and the need to exterminate the hundreds of millions of "surplus" human beings, the theory of the "natural and human" character of imperialist wars, of the obsoleteness of the principle of national sovereignty, of the "right" of English-speaking nations to dominate the world and so on. The political aim of these "theories" is obvious: to deceive the people, blunt their vigilance and unloose a third world war for world domination of the U.S. imperialists. The imperialist politicians and ideologists proceed in their predatory activity from

the law of the jungle. Frequently, they commit their monstrous crimes under the guise of "philanthropy" and "peacemaking."

Hypocrisy and mendacity—these are the distinguishing features of bourgeois ideology. The sworn enemies of democracy call their party "democratic," the enemies of the republican system call themselves "republicans," the enemies of freedom unite into a "party of liberty." The hypocritical and cynical talk about democracy, liberty and common weal serves the imperialist bourgeoisie as a screen for covering up its predatory policy both within and outside the country.

Idealistic philosophy, permeated with hypocrisy, mysticism and obscurantism, is the "theoretical" expression of the mendacity and hypocrisy of modern bourgeois society. In the early period of its existence the bourgeoisie preached materialism and atheism. But this weapon, dangerous to the bourgeoisie, has long ago been discarded by it. It has long ago declared war on materialism. Its ideologists now preach mysticism, obscurantism, most vulgar idealism and agnosticism.

Many bourgeois philosophers and scientists, including academicians and university professors, see their calling in advocating the impossibility of true, objective cognition of the world. They urge that science be subordinated to religion and also to war and human slaughter. Bourgeois ideology bears primarily a militarist, predatory and exploiting character.

An essential feature of bourgeois ideology is individualism, reflecting the system of private ownership, the conditions of commodity-capitalist economy and competition and converting bourgeois society into an arena of merciless battle. The so-called capitalist enterprise, lauded by bourgeois economists and poets, sociologists and publicists is actually nothing but a fight of "all against all" in accordance with the principle "Man to man is wolf."

Bourgeois ideologists proclaim the laws of the animal kingdom to be natural laws of social life and zoology the

second Gospel of capitalist society. Racialist ideology is the official ideology of the American imperialist bourgeoisie. The entire home and foreign policy of the American bourgeoisie is based on the ideology of fascism, racialism, fanaticism and cosmopolitanism. Apart from its own country, the American bourgeoisie appears everywhere, in all capitalist states, as the instigator of a reactionary crusade against democracy, the working class and its trade unions, against all progressive national-liberation movements and champions of peace.

Bourgeois reactionary ideology is countered in all quarters by the revolutionary socialist ideology of the working class, that is, by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, by scientific socialism.

Marxist, socialist ideology originated as the ideology of the working class, whose mission is to solve the conflict between the new productive forces and the obsolete bourgeois relations of production they have outgrown, the conflict between the social character of production and the private, capitalist mode of appropriating the fruits of production. Consequently, it was the urgent requirements of development of material life of society that brought forth the Marxist, socialist ideology.

Marxist, socialist ideology is a harmonious and integral system of ideas expressing the standing, interests and historical tasks of the working class—the grave-digger of capitalism and the creator of communism. It was evolved by Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the ideologists of the working class, on the basis of a critical analysis of all major achievements in science, including philosophy, on the basis of an analysis of the laws of development of capitalism and a theoretical generalization of the experience of the international working-class movement. The theory of scientific communism marks a revolutionary change in the views on society, the role of the working class and of all working people.

This theory has been introduced by the Marxist party into the spontaneous working-class movement, transforming it into a conscious struggle for the vital interests of the working class, for dictatorship of the proletariat, for socialism.

Marxism is the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the triumph of socialism in all countries, the science of building communist society.

Marxism-Leninism is the scientific expression of the cardinal interests of the working class. This creative revolutionary science does not stand still, but is developed and enriched by the experience of the revolutionary working-class movement of all countries and the experience of successful communist construction in the U.S.S.R.

The general theoretical basis of socialist ideology (scientific socialism) is dialectical and historical materialism, and Marxist-Leninist political economy.

Being the ideology of the working class, Marxism-Leninism holds that capitalism is a historically transient and now already obsolete system, and that modern monopoly capitalism is moribund, decaying capitalism and its class—the bourgeoisie—a reactionary class which has become thoroughly entangled in insoluble antagonistic contradictions. Marxist-Leninist ideology holds that the working class alone can destroy the old, capitalist system and create a new social system—a socialist system, that the working class alone can free all working people from capitalist enslavement and pauperism and ensure for all nations full equality in all spheres of life. Marxism-Leninism shows the only way of accomplishing this great aim which consists in overthrowing of bourgeois rule, establishing the dictatorship of the working class and of building socialism and communism.

Historical development has confirmed the vitality of Marxist-Leninist ideas. Marxism-Leninism has scored its greatest triumph in the U.S.S.R. where the Soviet people have built socialist society and are successfully building

communism, and where it has become the supreme and sole ideology, the ideology of the people. The dropping out of the capitalist system of a number of countries in Europe and Asia, the successful laying of the foundations of socialism in the People's Democracies, the emergence of the great Chinese People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic, the upsurge of the national-liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries and the growing prestige of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries testify to the victories recorded by Marxist-Leninist ideas in the post-war years.

Marxist ideology is a mighty instrument of revolutionary transformation of the obsolete capitalist society into a communist society. Socialist ideology provides Communist and workers' parties with a weapon to fight all enemies of communism. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has registered and is registering great victories because it is provided with the true compass—Marxist-Leninist science of the laws of development of society, of the laws of communist construction.

The enemies of the working class have time and again announced that Marxism-Leninism has been utterly refuted and destroyed but this great teaching lives, develops and triumphs. The epoch-making victory over the reactionary, fascist forces during World War II was achieved primarily by the Soviet army and the peoples of the U.S.S.R. brought up in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

Some of the ideologists of the American bourgeoisie complain that they have nothing but their old, rusty ideological weapon with which to fight the communist forces and the communist world outlook. They say that they have atomic bombs, tanks, shells, the bacteriological and chemical weapons against the U.S.S.R., but that they have not an effective ideological weapon or ideals acceptable to the masses. The "spiritual values" of the American bourgeoisie have lost their universal significance, says Angell, an American sociologist. Hence the ever new laborious efforts in the domain

of philosophy and sociology, political and economic theories, and the preposterous contests for a suitable "name" for capitalism.

But whatever name the ideologists of the bourgeoisie may bestow on capitalism, the latter will remain a decaying system and its ideology—a reflection of self-interest of the imperialists, capitalist lies, deception, violence and oppression of the masses.

John Foster Dulles, the notorious U.S. reactionary politician, said that the American imperialists had spent very little on the battle of ideas (in which they sustain defeat after defeat). In another speech delivered to graduates of Princeton University Dulles had to admit that a revolutionary spirit had gripped more than half of mankind.

U.S. imperialism as well as the entire camp of imperialist reaction is sustaining defeats in the battle of ideas certainly not because it is spending less billions on ideological warfare than on atomic bombs, tanks, warplanes or on preparations for bacteriological and chemical warfare. The American bourgeoisie spends a goodly sum on spiritual perversion of the masses. But its ideas are false and profoundly alien to the peoples. That is why imperialist reaction is suffering defeats in the "battle of ideas." The so-called "American way of life" cannot be seriously taken as a model and imposed on other nations by force of arms. The peoples of the world know what the real America is like, the country of dollar-atomic democracy, where financial oligarchy dominates, the country of savage subjugation of the workers, of the lynch law.

Capitalism cannot be seriously considered a paradise when it is hell for the toilers. Nor can it be considered the only possible social system when the land of socialism has proved in practice its superiority over capitalism. Bourgeois ideologists cannot any longer "scientifically" prove that the people cannot rule the state and society without the bourgeoisie when the Soviet people have for thirty-seven years been masters of their country and when the working people

in a number of countries in Europe and Asia are following their example.

It is impossible nowadays to deceive with impunity the peoples with the false theory of "superior" races, superiority of the Anglo-Saxons over other races, of the inability of Eastern nations to carry on creative historical activity. The peoples of the U.S.S.R., who belong to various nations, including the peoples of Central Asia, have proved their ability to engage in conscious, historical activity. They have created superior forms of economy compared to those under capitalism, a superior type of state and a superior, socialist culture. Today the great Chinese people are creating a historically new, democratic mode of life.

All this completely refutes the absurd, pseudo-scientific imperialist theory of "superior" and "inferior" races. The ideology of American imperialism and its corresponding policy evoke burning hatred of the working people for U.S. imperialism and the "American way of life." According to *The Chicago Tribune*, Baseby, Republican member of Congress from Illinois, reporting on his three months' trip to European countries, said that America was becoming the most hated nation in the world. He had to admit that the U.S. foreign policy was held in contempt in the West-European countries. Similar conclusions are being drawn by other congressmen.

Aware that the peoples abhor its ideology and policy, American imperialism is forced to look for new ways of camouflaging its reactionary nature. This is what the U.S. rulers—the sponsors of the policy of imperialist aggression—aim at when trying to pose in the guise of peace-makers before the peoples of the world.

Contrary to the false imperialist ideology, socialist ideology scientifically reflects the needs of development of the material life of society and the urgent necessity of transition from capitalism to socialism. Marxism is all-powerful because it is true and unfailing and because it shows mankind the right path, one that corresponds to the

laws of development of society. That is what makes socialist ideology so powerful, invincible and attractive to millions of people.

In contrast to the reactionary ideology of the bourgeoisie socialist ideology is revolutionary in origin, essence and social significance. Its revolutionary character is seen in the fact that it has not only scientifically proved the incongruity between the obsolete bourgeois relations of production and the modern productive forces but has also indicated the only correct revolutionary way of solving this conflict—the way of socialism. Socialist ideology is revolutionary because it expresses and scientifically substantiates the tasks of all progressive parties. Marxist ideology is the ideology of socialist revolution, the ideology of the oppressed and exploited masses. It guided the working class and the poor peasantry of Russia in the accomplishment of the Great October Socialist Revolution, it guided the Soviet people in the carrying out of socialist industrialization, collectivization of agriculture and a cultural revolution in the country. Under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, under the leadership of the Communist Party the Soviet people have built a socialist society and are now building communism.

ROLE OF ADVANCED IDEAS IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The origin of social ideas, views and political theories should be sought for in the conditions of material life of society, in the conditions of social being. The material life of society is primary and social consciousness, ideas and theories are secondary, a reflection of the conditions of material life. But this, of course, does not signify that social ideas, whatever be their ideological forms of expression, do not react on the development of the conditions of material life of society, social being and on the economic basis of society.

Bourgeois critics have repeatedly charged and now absurdly charge that historical materialism ignores the role of the "ideological factor" in social development, that Marxists allegedly reduce the development of society to some automatic action of the economy itself. This charge originates, on the one hand, from the ignorance of the bourgeois sociologists and, on the other hand, from their class interests, from their deliberate falsification of social science. Bourgeois ideologists, seeking to facilitate their fight against Marxism, begin by distorting it.

Historical materialism has always recognized the vital significance of social ideas, views and theories. Moreover, Marxism for the first time in the history of human thought has scientifically substantiated the immense role and significance of social consciousness and social ideas in the development of society.

That was precisely why Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin devoted all their lives to the deliverance of the proletariat from the clutches of bourgeois ideology, to the elaboration of the theory of scientific communism and to the inculcation of social consciousness in the working class. Way back in 1844 Marx wrote: "The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism of weapons, material force has to be displaced by material force itself; but theory too becomes a material force the moment it grips the masses."*

As is known, in the pre-Marxian period there prevailed an idealistic conception of history. Even philosophers who materialistically interpreted natural phenomena remained idealists in their views on society.

In creating their philosophical materialism, that is, the materialistic theory, Marx and Engels had, first of all, to wage a bitter struggle against idealism. In this struggle against the major adversary of the materialist theory Marx and Engels, naturally, had to concentrate mainly on proving

---

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works,* Russ. ed., Vol. I, p. 406.

the fundamental tenet of philosophical materialism—the determining role of the conditions of material life of society, and to underscore that social being is primary and social consciousness secondary, derivative. As regards the role and significance of social consciousness in the life of society, the retroaction of ideas on the development of material life of society, on social being—this question, though solved in principle in the works of Marx and Engels, was not, however, elaborated there in detail.

In the late years of Engels's life the danger arose of a revision of Marxism and its interpretation in the spirit of vulgar materialism, of denying the role of consciousness and ideas in the development of society. In 1890 Frederick Engels wrote: "Marx and I are ourselves partly to blame for the fact that the younger people sometimes lay more stress on the economic side than is due to it. We had to emphasize the main principle *vis-à-vis* our adversaries, who denied it, and we had not always the time, the place or the opportunity to allow the other elements involved in the interaction to come into their rights. But when it was a case of presenting a section of history, that is, of a practical application (of historical materialism—*F.K.*), it was a different matter and there no error was possible. Unfortunately, however, it happens only too often that people think they have fully understood a new theory and can apply it without more ado from the moment they have mastered its main principles, and even those not always correctly. And I cannot exempt many of the more recent 'Marxists' from this reproach, for the most amazing rubbish has been produced in this quarter, too."*

These latest muddle-headed "Marxists" were of the Bernstein type, vulgar materialists. They did not fully betray themselves during Engels's life but after his death began openly to revise Marxism in the spirit of vulgar materialism and idealism, in the spirit of opportunism.

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow 1951, p. 444.

The vulgar-materialist and opportunist interpretation of the role of social consciousness, of socialist ideology and of a Marxist party in the working-class movement led the revisionists to bow to spontaneity of the working-class movement, abandon the fight against bourgeois ideology and deny the necessity of a socialist revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat. Hence the tremendous danger which the vulgar-materialist theories presented to the revolutionary working-class movement.

Meanwhile, with the entry of capitalism into a new stage —the stage of imperialism—the contradictions of capitalism became unprecedentedly acute. The proletarian revolution was then already a real issue and, consequently, the question of the conscious activity of millions became a matter of decisive significance. In that epoch the pseudo-Marxist "theory" of the productive forces, propagated by the sorry theoreticians of the Second International, presented a particular danger. Proponents of this "theory" alleged that the productive forces alone, by their spontaneous development, not only prepare the material pre-requisites and conditions of socialism but lead to, and must with fatal inevitability bring about, socialism without any revolutionary theory, without any class struggle of the proletariat, without its revolutionary dictatorship.

The "theory" of the productive forces found its fullest expression in the reformist thesis of the peaceful "growing" of capitalism into socialism. This "theory" was upheld in Russia by such agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement as the "economists," then the Mensheviks and during Soviet rule by the Bukharinites—the traitors of the people.

The "economists," and in their wake the Mensheviks, sought to prove that since the productive forces and the economy determine the course of social development no ideologists would succeed in diverting the working-class movement from the pathway of spontaneity. The fundamental thesis of the "economists" was: "Politics obediently

follow the economy." Socialist consciousness, according to them, would also automatically follow the economy. Capitalist economy, they alleged, would peacefully and spontaneously grow into socialist economy and the working class spontaneously, solely under the influence of the economy, without its party, would work out a socialist consciousness.

This was the advocacy of khvostism which doomed the party of the proletariat to stagnation and reduced its role to nought. But the struggle against tsarism and capitalism in Russia required activity and revolutionary energy of the highest degree, organization and discipline, consciousness and heroism on the part of the working class and its Marxist party. However, only a Marxist party could impart a conscious and organized character to the working-class movement by combining socialist theory with the spontaneous working-class movement.

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement"*—that was how V. I. Lenin treated the question in his book *What Is To Be Done?*

Lenin was the first to substantiate the thesis that a revolutionary theory, linked with revolutionary practice, is a most potent force of the working-class movement. Only a revolutionary Marxist theory can and does instil confidence in the working-class movement, orientate and help it grasp the interconnection of the external events, since it alone permits practice to perceive not only how and in what direction the classes are moving at the given moment but what will be the course of their development in the near future.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the great leaders of the working class, gave it the revolutionary socialist theory. But who could combine this revolutionary theory with the working-class movement and thus impart to it a conscious and organized character? This could be done only by a Marxist party as the vanguard and guiding force of the

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Part I, Moscow 1952, p. 227.

working class, as the carrier of socialist consciousness. Such a revolutionary party, a party of a new type—the Communist Party—was created in Russia by V. I. Lenin.

Before the foundations of a united, centralized Marxist party could be laid it was necessary ideologically to smash the "economists," to expose them as an instrument of bourgeois influence among the working class and creatively to elaborate the ideological foundations of the Marxist party of the working class. This task was accomplished by V. I. Lenin. In his book *What Is To Be Done?*, published in 1902, he exhaustively elucidated the role of socialist consciousness in the working-class movement and of advanced ideas in the development of society. The book describes the ideological foundations of the Marxist party, the party of a new type. In this work V. I. Lenin brought out the tremendous significance of revolutionary theory, of socialist consciousness and of the Marxist party as the guiding force of the working-class movement. V. I. Lenin brilliantly substantiated the fundamental Marxist theses that a Marxist party is a union of the working-class movement with socialism, that social being determines social consciousness.

There are two sides to the problem of the relations between social being and social consciousness: one is the source of formation of social ideas, views and theories and the other is their role and significance.

In origin social ideas and views are secondary: they are derivatives of the conditions of material life of society. The spiritual life of society is a reflection of social being, of the conditions of material life. Being a reflection of the conditions of material life, social ideas, views and theories exercise a reverse influence on the development of material life of society, on social being. The role and significance of social ideas in social life and development of society are immense.

There are different kinds of social ideas and theories: they may be old, that is, obsolete and reactionary, or new, i.e., progressive and advanced.

The old social ideas, views and theories which have outlived their day serve the interests of the obsolescent forces of society. They retard the progress of society. Their reactionary character is manifest in the various ideas and theories of the modern imperialist bourgeoisie.

The ideas and theories of the imperialist bourgeoisie are a component of the superstructure on the capitalist basis. Their purpose is to safeguard and preserve this basis despite the fact that it is historically doomed. The imperialists spend billions of dollars on dissemination of their reactionary ideas. The old ideas and theories are reactionary since they uphold the obsolete basis and prevent the solution of the urgent tasks which arise in the course of development of material life of society.

The new ideas and theories, on the contrary, play a progressive role. They are to contribute to the development of society and its progress. They do not drop from the sky but arise out of the tasks of development of material life of society. They constitute an indispensable condition for the revolutionary transition from the old, moribund social system to the new, advanced and higher social system.

A revolution requires, above all, corresponding material pre-requisites, objective conditions, maturity of economic, social and political contradictions. But apart from these objective conditions the success of a revolution depends also on a subjective factor, namely, on the ability of the revolutionary class to solve the existing contradictions. This ability depends on the level of organization and consciousness of the advanced class, on its revolutionary spirit and capacity to guide the broad masses.

The fact of the matter is that objective, material and economic pre-requisites alone are not sufficient to effect a transition from the old system to a new one since the moribund ruling class employs the entire might of its superstructure—the state apparatus, the army, police, prisons—and all its means of ideological influence on the masses, to safeguard the old system. The difficulty of the class struggle

of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is precisely that the exploiting classes do not retain their rule by violence alone—by means of open, physical suppression with the help of the state. The obsolescent exploiting classes strive to suppress the masses spiritually, to poison the minds of the toiling masses with the venom of their reactionary ideology. Consequently, without overcoming the influence of the old ideas and views, without inculcating in the masses the new, advanced social ideas, it is impossible to weld, organize and mobilize the forces of the advanced class for the revolutionary transformation of the obsolete, reactionary social system.

The immense organizing, mobilizing and transforming significance of new ideas and theories can be illustrated by the example of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Having originated within capitalist society as a result of the new tasks of development of material life of society (in connection with the incongruity of the obsolete capitalist relations of production with the character of the new productive forces) the Marxist-Leninist ideas were infused into the spontaneous working-class movement by the Marxist party and penetrated the consciousness of the Russian working class, rallying and organizing it. Under the guidance of its vanguard—the Communist Party—the working class of Russia, armed with Marxism-Leninism, with the Leninist theory of the proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat, marched into battle against capitalism, shattered the old, capitalist basis and created a new socialist basis, a new social system —socialism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution wrought a radical change in world history, in the destinies of mankind, and above all in the destinies of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. It signified the triumph of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism, of the ideas of socialism, of socialist ideology over capitalist ideology, and of Leninism over opportunism.

The October Revolution delivered the millions of working people of our country from the yoke of exploitation, roused them for conscious historical creative work, for vigorous

political activity. It ushered in the great era of building a socialist society, differing fundamentally from all preceding social formations.

With capitalism as a social formation ends the pre-history of the human race. October 1917 marked a new era in world history, opened the first page of the genuine history of humanity, consciously created by the popular masses. Socialist society is the first ever to be created consciously and freely—freely, not in the sense, of course, of its being devoid of historical necessity. The enemies of socialism tried hard to vilify the October Revolution, to represent it as a reign of chaos, as an unruly, elemental upheaval of the masses, threatening civilization and culture. But if every social revolution in the past signified the awakening of the masses, their appearance on the arena of conscious political activity, the Great October Socialist Revolution was a vivid manifestation of the political maturity, consciousness and organization of millions of working people, headed by the proletariat and its vanguard—the Communist Party.

The masses and their leaders in all revolutions of the past, particularly all bourgeois revolutions, were, in a large measure, the victims of illusion. They had no scientific knowledge of the nature of revolution, its laws, motive forces or aims.

In *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* Marx states that the leaders of all former bourgeois revolutions borrowed their ideals from the past. The pioneers of the bourgeois revolution in England in the XVIIth century utilized images and illusions borrowed from the Old Testament, the pioneers of the French bourgeois revolution of the XVIIIth century sought inspiration in the legends of the ancient Roman republic.

The socialist revolution does not draw inspiration from the past. It draws it from the future. "It cannot begin with itself," wrote Marx, "before it has stripped off all superstition in regard to the past. Earlier revolutions required recollections of past world history in order to drug themselves concerning their own content. In order to arrive at

its own content, the revolution of the nineteenth century (the socialist revolution—*F.K.*) must let the dead bury their dead. There the phrase went beyond the content; here the content goes beyond the phrase."*

The expectations of the participants of bourgeois revolutions and the reality which resulted from these revolutions did not concur by a long way. The ideologists of the French bourgeois revolution of 1789—philosophers, poets and publicists—portrayed it as the forthcoming resurrection of reason, the glorious break of day, accession of truth, justice, liberty, equality, fraternity, universal happiness and prosperity. That was how their imagination pictured it. But in effect the French bourgeois revolution merely replaced one form of exploitation by another: feudal by capitalist exploitation. Freedom turned into freedom of exploitation, equality—into "equality" of the satisfied and the hungry, of the exploiters and the exploited and fraternity into irreconcilable enmity between the capitalists and the workers. "Justice" found its embodiment in the corrupt bourgeois jurisprudence which safeguards the pillars of capitalism. This is characteristic of all bourgeois revolutions.

Matters were different during the Great October Socialist Revolution. Its theory, aims, tasks, slogans and the banner under which the revolutionary masses fought, as well as its results—the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism—fully coincided.

The October Revolution confirmed the Lenin-Stalin thesis concerning the great mobilizing and transforming role of progressive social ideas and the advanced social theory. Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution gave the Communist Party and the working class of the U.S.S.R. the power of orientation, clear prospects and confidence in the triumph of socialism.

This new, Lenin's theory of socialist revolution stemmed from the law of uneven economic and political development

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works,* Vol. I, Moscow 1951, p. 227.

of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism. On the basis of this law V. I. Lenin drew his brilliant conclusion that the victory of socialism is possible first in one, separate country and that it cannot triumph simultaneously in all countries. Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution smashed the dogmas of the Second International contending that socialism would triumph first in Western Europe, in the industrially developed countries where the proletariat comprised the majority of the population, where bourgeois democracy had already existed for decades. Lenin's theory refuted these dogmas. It armed the working class ideologically, indicating a clear way to victory. Lenin's theory of socialist revolution was one of the greatest discoveries in Marxist science.

Guided by this theory, the Communist Party was able to rally the workers and toiling peasants, to give them clear militant slogans, to arm and mobilize them for the fight against capitalism. The course of the revolutionary events confirmed Lenin's foresight of the possible victory of socialist revolution in Russia prior to such a revolution in Western Europe. It smashed to smithereens the "prophecy" of the Trotskyites that the victory of socialism could not be achieved in one country; the course of the revolution refuted the entire despicable ideology, hostile to Leninism, of the betrayers and traitors.

Lenin's theory of socialist revolution was a bold challenge to all enemies of socialism. It smashed the deeply-rooted traditions and prejudices and led the Party and the working class along the right road of socialist revolution. If not for Lenin's theory of proletarian revolution, the Communist Party and the working class would have been disorganized, the socialist revolution would have been deprived of guidance and the enemies of the proletariat would have benefited by it. Lenin's theory of the proletarian revolution found its concrete expression and embodiment in the militant slogan "All power to the Soviets!", comprehensible and appealing to the masses. The slogans of the Communist Party kindled the revolutionary sentiments of the

masses, roused their fury against the enemies of revolution.

In the course of his many years of ideological and political struggle against the foes of Marxism, the great Lenin perfected the Marxist theory in order to prepare the ground for its success and triumph in October 1917. He profoundly and creatively developed all aspects of Marxism, taking into account the new era in the development of world capitalism, the experience of the international working-class movement, as well as the specific nature of the economic and political development of Russia.

Marxism-Leninism holds that the more accurately a social theory reflects the requirements of the development of social being, the greater is its organizing and transforming role in the development of society. The Leninist theory of socialist revolution accorded with the newly matured economic requirements of society. Having gripped the masses it became a potent force. The favourable historical situation, the great intrinsic truth of Lenin's ideas, the brilliant strategic and tactical leadership of the Communist Party whose slogans brought the masses to socialist revolution and rallied them for the final assault on capitalism—these were the objective and subjective factors which determined the victory of the October Revolution, which made it possible to establish Soviet power, consolidate and uphold it in the fight against foreign and home enemies.

The Great October Socialist Revolution effected a revolution also in the minds, in the ideology of the working class. It ensured the triumph of socialist ideology over bourgeois ideology, the triumph of Leninism over opportunism and reformism. But this did not yet signify that the working millions had already, on the morrow of the revolution, completely rid themselves of the views, habits, customs and morals of the old, bourgeois society. The education of the masses in the spirit of communism is effected solely on the basis and with the help of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Here a decisive role is played by the Communist Party—the great leader, educator and organizer of the people.

ROLE OF SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY IN THE BUILDING OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The difficulties encountered in the building of a new, socialist society in the U.S.S.R. were due in the first place to the fact that pre-revolutionary Russia was technically and economically a relatively backward country, and that for a long time the Land of Soviets was the only country building socialism in the conditions of a hostile capitalist encirclement. The peoples of the U.S.S.R. had no way of acquiring practical experience in socialist construction since no such experience existed in history; they were the first to start building a new, socialist society. Today the People's Democracies, guided by the experience of the U.S.S.R., find it much easier to build socialism.

Ideologically to unite and organize the popular masses of the first country to take the path of socialism, to show them the ways and means of building a new life, to furnish them with a clear aim answering their cardinal interests and to give them strength and confidence in victory—this was the task of socialist ideology. The Communist Party had to work out a clear programme and scientifically to substantiate the possibilities and the ways and means of struggle for socialism, so that the working masses might build not on chance but in full confidence that the victory of socialism was possible and would be secured. This clarity of purpose and of ways and means of achieving it was furnished by Lenin's theory of the possibility of the triumph of socialism in one separate country, by the plan of socialist industrialization and electrification of the country, by Lenin's famous co-operative plan and his profound substantiation of the tasks of the cultural revolution.

Guided by this programme the Communist Party and its Central Committee, headed by the great Lenin, and after his death by Stalin, the great continuer of his cause, led the masses along the road of socialist construction.

The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. signified the

triumph of the policy of the Communist Party, a policy which constitutes the very basis of Soviet society. In a relentless political and ideological struggle against all its adversaries, the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinites, against nationalists of all shades and colour the Party, under the banner of Leninism, smashed all the bourgeois ideological trends alien to socialism. This was an indispensable condition for the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R., for victory over the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elemental forces, over bourgeois theories and the opportunist theory of spontaneity.

Without shattering the hostile ideas and theories, without surmounting the anti-popular and anti-Leninist theories, the victory of socialism would have been impossible.

The triumph of socialism in the U.S.S.R. is eloquent and convincing proof of the great mobilizing, organizing and transforming role of a revolutionary social theory, of a revolutionary party and of the conscious element in the development of society.

Under socialism the Marxist revolutionary theory, by arming the party and the masses—the builders of communism—with the knowledge of the laws of development of society, gives them a clear understanding of the processes taking place in the depths of social life, enables them to foresee the course of events and to direct their activity and the entire social development in accordance with the objective laws, relying on these laws.

The victory of the October Socialist Revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class signified the triumph of Marxist, socialist ideology. But during the transition period from capitalism to socialism, prior to the triumph of socialism in all spheres of the national economy, along with the socialist economic form there existed a petty-commodity and private capitalist form. The capitalist elements in the country, still strongly entrenched in petty-commodity production and backed by the international bourgeoisie, waged a fierce fight against socialism.

Petty-commodity production spontaneously engendered capitalism, animating capitalist elements and their ideology, hostile to socialism. The economic foundation of socialist ideology during the transition period from capitalism to socialism was the socialist form which played a leading role in the economy. However, when socialism prevailed in all fields of the national economy, when the exploiting classes were eliminated, socialist ideology found a firm material base in the undividedly dominating socialist basis and became firmly rooted in the consciousness of people. The more the socialist system displays its overall superiority over capitalism, the more telling is the revolutionizing and active role of socialist ideology and its influence on the consciousness of people.

Prior to the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class the Communist Party and the foremost, conscious workers following its lead, were the only active advocates and champions of socialist ideology. With the triumph of the socialist revolution socialist ideology has been inculcated in millions of people not only by Party organizations but also by a wide network of cultural and educational institutions of the socialist state and by numerous public organizations of the working people.

As a result of the October Socialist Revolution and in the course of socialist construction, socialist ideology itself developed, becoming enriched with the brilliant works of Lenin, of Stalin—the continuer of his cause—and of their companions-in-arms. These works and the decisions of the Communist Party sum up the gigantic experience of millions of builders of socialism, the experience of the Party, which directs socialist construction, the experience of its struggle against the adversaries of Leninism in the country and the world over.

The Party's educational work was and is based on the thesis that social being determines social consciousness. Social being is changed by men in conformity with the laws of development. Under the leadership of the Communist

Party the Soviet people, while changing the conditions of life, their social being and building a new life, modified also themselves, their nature, consciousness, habits and ethics. The new socialist traits of Soviet people were forged in the October battles, during the Civil War, in the struggle for socialist industrialization of the country and collectivization of agriculture and in the fight against the fascist invaders during the Great Patriotic War. The Communist Party has become a great educator, remoulding the minds of tens of millions of people. The Party effects communist education of the masses not by means of abstract enlightenment, but in close contact with the immediate tasks of socialist and communist construction.

In less than 15 years the Soviet Union effected a sweeping change—from technical and economic backwardness to advanced, socialist economy, based on the greatest achievements of science and technique. This was possible only because industrialization, collectivization and application of the new techniques concurred with the vital interests of the masses and because, educated by the Communist Party in the spirit of socialist ideology, the masses displayed high socialist consciousness.

Socialist ideology instils in Soviet people love for and fidelity to their country and national pride. The Soviet people were the first in the world to uproot capitalism and create a new, socialist society, thereby indicating to mankind the way to emancipation from capitalist slavery.

Soviet people take pride in the knowledge that their country is the hope of the progressive world, the citadel of the fight for peace, democracy and socialism and for a bright future for all peoples. The eyes of the peoples of all countries are turned to the U.S.S.R. which is a source of inspiration in the struggle of the peoples against capitalist slavery, imperialist plunder and barbarism.

In the Soviet Union the ideas of moral and political unity, friendship of the peoples and Soviet patriotism have

triumphed. They are a mighty driving force in the development of Soviet society.

Friendship among the peoples is a source of inexhaustible power of the socialist state.

The strength of Soviet patriotism is that, unlike bourgeois pseudo-patriotism, it is founded not on race or national prejudice, but on the boundless devotion and fidelity of the people to their socialist homeland, on the fraternal co-operation of the working people of all nations of the Soviet Union and on respect for all peoples of the world, large and small. Soviet patriotism harmonically combines the national traditions of the peoples and the common, vital interests of all working people of the Soviet Union. Soviet patriotism does not divide but, on the contrary, unites all nations and nationalities of the U.S.S.R. into a single close-knit family. This is what explains the indestructible and ever-growing friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Soviet patriotism is permeated with the spirit of friendship and fraternity of the peoples, of respect for the freedom and independence of all nations. Soviet patriotism welds the multiple nations of the U.S.S.R. into a close-knit family of peoples on the basis of co-operation and mutual assistance. Therefore, a vital and indefeasible feature of socialist ideology is proletarian internationalism—the idea of international solidarity of the working people of all countries.

Socialist ideology is the ideology of proletarian internationalism, of equality, friendship and fraternity of the peoples. One of the most important ideological factors which assured the victory of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R. was the Lenin-Stalin national policy based on the principle of equality of nations, races and peoples.

The triumph of socialism signifies, at the same time, the triumph of the ideology of socialist internationalism over the ideology of bourgeois nationalism. The slogan of socialist internationalism: "Workers of all countries, unite!"—is sacred to all Soviet people.

The great Marxist-Leninist teaching on the equality and friendship of the peoples has, for the first time in history, been put into effect in socialist society, in the multi-national Soviet state. Marxism-Leninism holds that no nation can be free which oppresses other nations. ". . .The October Revolution," wrote J. V. Stalin, "has broken the chains of national and colonial oppression and freed from it, without exception, all the oppressed nations of a vast state. The proletariat cannot emancipate itself without emancipating the oppressed nations. It is a characteristic feature of the October Revolution that it accomplished these national-colonial revolutions in the U.S.S.R. not under the flag of national enmity and conflicts among nations, but under the flag of mutual confidence and fraternal rapprochement of the workers and peasants of the various nationalities in the U.S.S.R.; not in the name of *nationalism*, but in the name of *internationalism*."*

The victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. exploded the reactionary, racial, nationalistic "theories" of the so-called superior and inferior races. The numerous peoples of the U.S.S.R., belonging to different races, have thrown off the yoke of capitalism. Guided by the Communist Party they manifested matchless ability for the historical creation of socialist modes of life, of socialist statecraft and socialist culture. The socialist ideology of equality and friendship of the peoples manifested thereby its great power.

This ideology which has become firmly established in the U.S.S.R. is a great source of power of socialist society. The task of communist education is to continue to consolidate and develop friendship among the peoples, to imbue in the people Soviet patriotism, love for and fidelity to the Soviet country, hatred for the enemies of socialism and a readiness to defend the country against the aggressive acts of the hostile imperialist forces.

Nationalistic survivals are a betrayal of the Leninist

---

* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow 1954, p. 240.

ideology of internationalism. They weaken the moral and political unity as well as the friendship of the peoples. Imperialist encirclement strives to revive bourgeois, nationalistic survivals in the minds of people. Therefore, the Communist Party has always waged a relentless struggle against the ideology of nationalism, for complete elimination of nationalistic survivals in the minds of Soviet people.

The moral and political unity of Soviet society, friendship of the peoples and Soviet patriotism are the new driving forces in the development of socialist society. They emerged as a result of the victory of socialism. They are closely interconnected and interdependent, and influence the entire course of the economic, political and cultural development of the U.S.S.R.

Ideological activity among the masses is the paramount duty of the Communist Party. Any weakening of the influence of socialist ideology means strengthening the influence of bourgeois ideology. In socialist society there is not, nor can there be, any economic or class basis for domination of bourgeois ideology. In our country socialist ideology dominates. But in Soviet society survivals of bourgeois ideology still remain. They do not disappear of their own accord. They subsist and in certain conditions may grow.

It is necessary always to remember that as long as capitalist encirclement exists, the possibility remains of alien views, ideas and sentiments penetrating our country from outside as well as "...from inside, from the relics of groups hostile to the Soviet state which have not been completely demolished by the Party. It should not be forgotten that the enemies of the Soviet Union are working to inculcate, foment and foster unhealthy sentiments, ideologically to corrupt the unstable elements in our society."*

As is known, in its development consciousness lags behind the changes in the conditions of material life of

---

* G. Malenkov, *Report to the Nineteenth Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, Moscow 1952, p. 127.

society; capitalist survivals, antiquated views, ideas and theories continue to corrupt and blur the consciousness even when the conditions that had engendered these ideas, views and theories vanish. Relics of capitalism in the consciousness of people, birth-marks of the old society in every-day life, ethics and psychology are inevitable under socialism. They persist by force of habit, tradition and sometimes are even revived as a result of difficulties, shortcomings and contradictions in the development of socialist society.

Hence the importance of developing and perfecting socialist culture, science, literature and art and of applying all the means of ideological and political influence, communist propaganda and agitation, and the press to improving the ideological training of Party and non-Party cadres, to whetting the political vigilance and consciousness of the workers, peasants and the intelligentsia.

The Marxist-Leninist theory is a powerful instrument in developing socialist consciousness in Soviet people. Socialist ideology enables working people clearly to perceive the superiority of the socialist economic system and of the socialist order over the capitalist order.

The Communist Party's ideological work is an important means of purging the minds of people of the relics of capitalism, of the prejudices and pernicious traditions of the old society.

The need to intensify communist education and ideological work does not only flow from the fact that relics of the old society persist in the consciousness of Soviet people; it also emerges from the majestic tasks of building communism. In order successfully to accomplish the tasks of communist construction it is necessary to raise the consciousness of the people to the level of the heightened tasks. Communism is a society of highly developed individuals, where work will become a necessity, a joy and pleasure. Such development of society calls for great effort on the part of the Party in the sphere of ideological and cultural education of the masses.

The entire work of the Party, including ideological activity, is subordinated to the lofty and noble aim of building a communist society in which all citizens will be cultured and educated, and will play a conscious and active role in public life.

The masses, led by the Communist Party, constitute the main force that creates socialism and communism. Marxism holds that it is the people who are basically the architects of history. Both the cult of the individual and the subjectivist denial of the objective character of the laws of development of society have been and may become an ideological weapon in the hands of adventurist elements. These views lead to the liquidation of the Marxist tenet of the objective character of the laws of development of society and of the people being the basic architects of history, the builders of communism. What, indeed, is the idealistic cult of the individual? It is superstitiously to worship outstanding personalities, to attribute to them super-natural properties and powers to do things which the Party alone, the advanced social class and the people can and do actually accomplish. The cult of the individual by the socialist-utopians and the narodniks was manifest in that they linked the destinies of socialism not with the struggle of the working class, not with the creative activity of the masses but with the exploits of individual, outstanding, "critically-minded personalities," "heroes." As is known the socialist-utopians in Western Europe and the Russian narodniks suffered fiasco. The Communist Party and Lenin, its founder, waged a relentless struggle against the idealistic theory of the cult of the individual, alien to the cause of communism.

Some people confuse the recognition by Marxism of the immense role played by great historical personalities, by the leaders of classes and parties, with the cult of the individual. That is a fundamental mistake. Marxism does not at all deny the role of outstanding personalities in history. V. I. Lenin vividly brought out the role played by Marx and Engels as the creators of Marxism, the founders

of the First International and the leaders and teachers of the working class. J. V. Stalin graphically portrayed Lenin's role as the leader of the world proletariat, the founder of the Communist Party and of the Soviet state, the brilliant thinker who creatively developed Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. An immense role was also played by J. V. Stalin, the disciple and continuer of Lenin's cause. However, the role of the leaders of the proletariat is inseparably linked with the activity of the Communist Party and the working class. They draw their strength from the Party which unites the leaders with the class and the masses.

Throughout its history the Communist Party has effected collective leadership of the working-class movement and of the struggle for communism. The cult of the individual belittles the role of collective leadership, the role of the Central Committee of the Party. It disarms the Party and the working class, prevents them from mobilizing the creative initiative of the masses; therefore, an urgent task of the Party's ideological work is to root out the cult of the individual, to overcome subjectivism in interpreting the character of the laws of development of socialist society.

The strength of the people lies in their unity, organization and communist consciousness, in clearly comprehending the tasks advanced by the Party and the socialist state. The Soviet people manifested a high degree of consciousness in the years of industrialization and collectivization, as well as during the Great Patriotic War and the rehabilitation of the enemy-ravaged economy. This consciousness is being manifested even more vividly in the course of communist construction. But however great the successes of communist education may be the new tasks call for even higher consciousness of the masses, for intensification of the Party's ideological work.

Our Party and the Soviet state effect communist education of the people through a network of cultural and educational institutions which enter the superstructure of

socialist society, i.e., through schools, libraries, clubs, theatres, cinemas, through the press, radio, etc. That is why the Party and the state have always devoted so much attention to perfecting these institutions and all the means of socialist culture, to raising their ideological level, content and quality of their work. The Communist Party utilizes science, communist ethics, art and literature for communist education.

Soviet literature and art has played a particularly important role in disseminating socialist and communist ideas, the principles of communist ethics and in shaping the sentiments and thoughts of the broad masses. Mindful of the immense educational value of literature and art, the Communist Party has worked and is working for imbuing communist ideology in Soviet literature and art, against ideological and political indifference. The more perfect socialist art and literature are in ideological content and artistic form, the more truthfully they reflect reality, the greater is their influence on the masses.

Communist education is omnipotent when it is related with life and practice. Active participation of the masses in the practical work of building communism has always been of decisive significance for their communist education.

Communist education and training have always, at all stages of development of the Soviet system, embraced questions of politics, economics and culture. The aim of communist education in the political domain was and is to consolidate the Soviet social and state system, socialist democracy, to draw the masses into the administration of their state, reinforce the alliance of the workers and peasants, the moral and political unity of socialist society, the friendship of the peoples and to cultivate in the broad masses Soviet patriotism and fidelity to the state, to the Communist Party and the communist cause.

The socialist state draws its strength from the consciousness of the masses, from their loyalty, patriotism, activity and creative initiative. Criticism and self-criticism,

especially criticism from below, are a form of conscious political activity of the masses which give the people the feeling that they are the masters of the country. This explains the efforts of the Party to promote the broadest possible criticism from below.

The education and re-education of society in the economic field is to inculcate a communist attitude towards public property and labour, to foster conscious discipline. Vast successes have been registered in this sphere. But the building of communism calls for such re-education of society when, firstly, socialist property, for all its members, will become the indefeasible groundwork of the new society, that is, sacred and inviolable, when embezzlers of public property will vanish. Then all, without exception, will seek to preserve and develop socialist property, since upon this depends both the existence and development of socialist society and the well-being of all its members. Secondly, the object of communist education in the economic sphere is that labour for all members of socialist society should constitute not only a sacred duty but a vital necessity, a joy and pleasure. This cannot be accomplished merely by propaganda and agitation. This calls for further changes in the conditions of socialist labour. In order to root out the old attitude towards labour as a kind of arduous obligation it has been necessary to abolish capitalist ownership of the means of production and exploitation. To enable the development of socialist emulation in its contemporary, higher form, it has been necessary not only to eradicate capitalism and exploitation, but also to develop new technique and new cadres of workers who have mastered the most advanced techniques of socialist production. To make labour a matter of prime necessity for all members of society, a source of joy and pleasure, it is necessary further to develop technique, completely to electrify the economy, automatize production and to attain such a high productivity of labour as to make it possible later on to reduce working hours, considerably improve housing conditions and increase real wages.

The measures mapped out by the Party assure the achievement of these lofty aims. Development of technique, introduction of the latest scientific discoveries in production, measures for creating an abundance of material values and for improving to the utmost the well-being of the people—all this is essential for transforming socialist labour into communist labour, into a vital necessity for all members of society.

This also requires a cultural re-education of the members of society and all-round development of their physical and mental abilities. The way to this end is universal, compulsory ten-grade education and polytechnization of the school, that is, assimilation of the fundamentals of modern science and technique and ability to apply the acquired knowledge in practice. This represents a tremendous potential source of social progress and development of the productive forces. The cultural growth of the members of society will exercise a revolutionizing influence not only on labour productivity, but on the very character of labour, on its further creative development and on the process of abolition of the still existing essential distinctions between mental and manual labour.

Capitalism implies ever increasing exploitation of the labouring people, it starves and emasculates the spiritual life of the individual, and brings about the growing backwardness and ignorance of the masses. In the capitalist countries science and technique are levelled against the working class and the popular masses. Under socialism science and technique and all the major achievements of human genius are made to serve the people, lighten labour, promote all-round development of all members of society.

This all-round development is no longer a cherished dream, a remote aim; this cherished dream and aim is being put into effect in the day-to-day life, in the creative labour and training of millions of workers and collective farmers. The ever-growing socialist emulation also contains the

embryo of and assures the future all-round physical and mental development of the members of society. Socialist emulation is the way and the means of transforming labour into a vital necessity. What today is the shoot of the communist future must, and will inevitably become, the fundamental quality of all people, their mode of behaviour, habit, an inalienable feature of their mentality. The urgent task of the Communist Party and the Soviet state in the sphere of economic and cultural re-education of the members of society is firmly to instil in all working people the view that public property is the sacred, inviolable and indefeasible foundation of society and of popular welfare and to make labour a prime necessity and pleasure for all members of socialist society.

The world is divided into two opposing camps: the camp of socialism and the camp of imperialism. In the countries of the socialist camp there is peaceful constructive work, steady progress, powerful development of the productive forces and a flourishing socialist culture.

In the countries of the imperialist camp there is stagnation of the productive forces, militarization of the economy and uncertainty of the morrow.

Hence the two opposite lines of development. The two opposing laws of development are reflected in the two opposing ideologies—bourgeois and socialist.

Bourgeois ideology is permeated with uncertainty, confusion, pessimism, despair, with enmity towards progress, towards everything advanced, revolutionary, democratic, popular and humane. It is the ideology of anti-humanism advocating predatory wars, violence, fanaticism, obscurantism and betrayal of national interests.

The other, socialist ideology, which dominates in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies, is rallying under its banner more and more millions of working people in

all capitalist countries. Socialist ideology is permeated with historical optimism, with confidence that socialism will triumph in all countries. Socialist ideology reflects the cardinal interests of the masses and of all progressive mankind; it is the ideology of friendship and equality of nations, of peace among the peoples. It is imbued with an indomitable revolutionary spirit.

The success of the conscious activity of the millions of Soviet people, who have built a socialist society and are now building communism, is assured by the fact that the Communist Party, heading the people, relies on the discovered and consciously utilized objective laws. The entire activity of the C.P.S.U., all the victories recorded by socialism under its wise and glorious leadership result from the correct and conscious utilization of the objective laws of development of society.

The bourgeoisie and its ideologists—the reactionary scientists—refuse to recognize the existence of objective laws of development of society since these laws lead to the inevitable doom of capitalism, filling the bourgeoisie with fear and horror. The reactionary bourgeoisie is, therefore, against genuine social science; instead it has adopted idealism, mysticism, religious obscurantism.

The Communist Party and all Soviet people, in accord with reality and history, recognize the existence of objective laws of social development. These laws lead to the inevitable triumph of communism. The objective laws of social development inspire in the progressive forces of the world confidence in the triumph of socialism in all countries.

It is Marxism-Leninism that assures the cognition of the objective laws of social development.

The strength of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union lies in the profound knowledge of Marxist science, in its creative development on the basis of new experience. With the torch of the Marxist-Leninist theory the Communist Party lights the way of the Soviet people forward towards communism.

The peoples of the U.S.S.R. derive their power and might from the fact that the great ideas of communism permeate their minds. These ideas have become a mighty material driving force. The great ideas of socialism, democracy and peace have won to their side hundreds of millions of people in various countries of the world.

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics